DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 426 SP 040 951

TITLE	The Full Circle: Building a Coherent Teacher Preparation System. The Report of the NASBE Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Boards of Education, Alexandria, VA.
SPONS AGENCY	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.; Department of Education, Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-1-58434-046-0
PUB DATE	2000-10-00
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of State Boards of Education, 277 South Washington Street, Suite 100, Alexandria, VA 22314 ($12). Tel: 800-368-5023 (Toll Free).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; Beginning Teacher Induction; Beginning Teachers; College School Cooperation; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; National Standards; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development Schools; Teacher Competencies; Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

Research shows that teacher quality may be one of the most significant factors in student achievement. This report includes five chapters that focus on: (1) "Introduction and Executive Summary"; (2) "Coordinating K-12 and Higher Education to Support High-Quality Teacher Preparation" (e.g., coordinating teacher candidate experience in K-12 and higher education institutions); (3) "Building Linkages Within Higher Education to Support High-Quality Teacher Preparation" (e.g., developing shared standards in institutions of higher education); (4) "Building a Coordinated System of New Teacher Support" (e.g., the need for new teacher standards and adequate program funding); and (5) "Ensuring Program Results with an Effective Accountability System" (e.g., elements of an accountability system and the role of state policy evaluation in ensuring program results). Recommendations of the Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education are included. The six appendixes present draft standards for Professional Development Schools from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the NCATE, the Teacher Education Accreditation Council, Augusta State University educator guarantee, Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium model standards for new teachers, and presenters to the Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education. (Contains 24 endnotes.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 467 426

SP

NASBE

THE FULL CIRCLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Welburn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Building a Coherent Teacher Preparation System

From the NASBE Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education

SP040951

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Full Circle: Building a Coherent Teacher Preparation System

The Report of the NASBE Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education

October 2000

Members of the Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education

Mary Jean Montgomery (Chair), Iowa

Lydia Carol Gabbard (Vice Chair), Kentucky

Randy DeHoff, Colorado

Anne Dillman, New Jersey

Wayne Feller, Oregon

Jean Gulliver, Maine

David Johnson, New York

Jane Norwood, North Carolina

Beverly Peterson, Nebraska

Sandra Ray, Alabama

I. B. Sonny Rundell, Kansas

Claibourne Smith, Delaware

Eileen Weiser, Michigan

Barbara Weston, South Carolina

Jack Wisthoff, Maryland

Ex Officio Members

Mary Dilworth
Senior Director for Research
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)

Shari Francis
Vice-President for State Relations
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

Carol Gilbert
Director of Educator Preparation in Higher Education
Massachusetts Department of Education

Frank Murray
President
Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

NASBE Staff

Carla Claycomb
Jeanne Pecori

Additional copies of **The Full Circle: Building a Coherent Teacher Preparation System** are available for $12.00 each plus 10% for shipping and handling ($4.00 minimum) from NASBE at

277 South Washington Street
Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314

All orders under $50.00 must be prepaid
Call 800-220-5183 for more information
Volume discounts available

Copyright © 2000
National Association of
State Boards of Education
All rights reserved
ISBN 1-58434-046-0

NASBE wishes to thank the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for generously contributing financial support to the Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education

Printing of this report was made possible by funding from the State Education Improvement Partnership, under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The contents of this report are solely the responsibility of NASBE and do not necessarily represent the views of any other members of the Partnership or the U.S. Department of Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

	Recommendations of the Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education	4
Chapter I	Introduction and Executive Summary	5
Chapter II	Coordinating K-12 and Higher Education to Support High-Quality Teacher Preparation	12
Chapter III	Building Linkages within Higher Education to Support High-Quality Teacher Preparation	20
Chapter IV	Building a Coordinated System of New Teacher Support	29
Chapter V	Ensuring Program Results with an Effective Accountability System	34
	Endnotes	42
	Appendices	
A	Draft Standards for Professional Development Schools from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education	43
B	The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)	45
C	The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)	46
D	Augusta State University Educator Guarantee	47
E	Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Model Standards for New Teachers	49
F	Presenters to the Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education	50

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Recommendations of the Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education

Coordination

Chapter I — It is the role of the state to lead a K-16 institutional collaboration that ensures all teachers can bring students to high levels of learning. Policymakers enacting reforms intended to improve student achievement need to place teachers at the center of reform efforts and provide them with the knowledge and skills they need to help students achieve high standards.

Chapter II — Higher education institutions, K-12 schools, and the policymakers who govern both systems need to recognize and articulate the role each plays in the success of the others and coordinate their missions, goals, policies, and practices to prepare teachers who can bring students to high levels of achievement.

Chapter III — Policymakers need to support university administrators as they build a campus-wide commitment to teacher preparation that includes strong collaboration between education and arts and sciences faculty and between K-12 and higher education.

Accountability

Chapter III — State policymakers need to hold higher education institutions responsible for the outcomes of their teacher preparation programs through comprehensive evaluation criteria that include multiple measures and are tied to program approval.

Chapter III — States need to reconsider policies that require acceptance of transfer credits from one institution to another, encourage higher education institutions to develop shared standards of course content and rigor, and vest ultimate authority to accept or deny course transfers with the degree-granting institution.

Chapter IV — States should develop and support new teacher induction programs, hold them accountable for the extent to which they help new teachers improve their practice, and require preparing institutions to participate in the transition from preparation to practice.

Chapter V — State policymakers need to be well informed of existing program standards developed by various national organizations and decide upon a standards system that most appropriately aligns with their particular expectations for K-12 students.

Chapter V — Policymakers at all levels of the education system need to hold themselves accountable for their role in planning, facilitating, and providing the resources to sustain a high-quality, coordinated system of teacher preparation.

apter I

Introduction and Executive Summary

The Importance of Teacher Preparation

Good teaching matters. More and more, teachers, policymakers, parents, and others are realizing that student achievement need not be prescribed by socio-economic status, parent involvement, or race and ethnicity;* on the contrary, recent evidence makes clear that regardless of the factors that students bring to school, good teachers measurably increase student learning, and good schools foster high levels of student achievement in large part because of the quality of their teachers.[1] As a matter of fact, teacher quality may be one of the most significant factors in student achievement.[2] Although knowledge about the link between effective teaching and high levels of student learning remains incomplete, the connection is clear and unequivocal. For example, one study from Tennessee shows that two second-graders who perform equally on a standardized test can be separated by 50 percentile points by the fifth grade solely as a consequence of being taught by different teachers.[3] States such as Connecticut and North Carolina that have undertaken successful initiatives to improve teacher knowledge by improving teacher preparation programs have at the same time also shown some of the most dramatic improvement on standard measures of student achievement.[4]

Not only do we know that good teaching matters, but we have some idea of the characteristics shared by good teachers.[5]

- Good teachers know their subject well;[6]
- Good teachers understand the process of teaching and learning and can apply their understanding;[7]
- Teachers who have relatively high scores on verbal tests, such as the SAT or ACT, are more effective at helping students achieve well on verbal measures of achievement;[8] and
- Good teachers have had the opportunity to hone their teaching skills in guided clinical experiences.[9]

In other words, being a good teacher is not just intuitive. On the contrary, effective teaching requires knowledge and practice. Teacher preparation programs that ensure subject-matter and pedagogical knowledge, hone verbal skills, and provide extensive clinical experience play an important role in producing high-quality teachers and, as a result, in bringing about student achievement gains.

In addition to what we understand about the direct links between good teachers and student achievement and between effective teacher preparation programs and good teachers, we can identify the elements that effective teacher preparation programs share:[10]

*In the 1960s and '70s, significant policy was set according to the findings of James Coleman. Coleman asserted that socio-economic factors had significant impact on student achievement and that there was little teachers or other school staff could do to compensate for the crippling effects of poverty and other types of "deprivation" on student achievement. Current research among students from across the socio-economic spectrum clearly contradicts Coleman and challenges states and districts to devise policies that enable excellence regardless of the factors students bring to school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Effective preparation programs share a common vision of high-quality teaching that permeates all course work and clinical experiences;
- They are guided by a well-defined set of standards;
- They contain a rigorous core curriculum in the liberal arts and require education and arts and sciences faculty to combine the pedagogical and liberal arts elements of teacher education;
- They use problem-based methods of learning, such as case studies, portfolios, and self-assessment;
- They build strong relationships with local schools that are reform-minded and have the support of both the university administration and the leaders of partner schools;
- They insist upon a rigorous entrance process;
- They guide new teachers into the field rather than "cut them loose" after graduation;
- They couple theory with practice; and
- They continuously assess their outcomes.

Despite advances in *knowledge* about what constitutes good teacher preparation, however, there is broad agreement that the actual *practice* of preparing teachers often remains inadequate.[11] The American Federation of Teachers, for example, describes many teacher preparation programs as, "beset by serious problems," and the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future said in its 1996 report that "Long-standing problems with teacher education have been widely documented in recent years." The report noted such problems as "fragmentation" that separates academic content from pedagogy, "uninspired teaching" by faculty, a superficial "once over lightly" curriculum, and haphazard policies or political expediency that allow poor-performing education programs to continue despite their inadequacies.[12] A number of teacher preparation programs continue to be out-of-touch with the knowledge and skills teachers need to be effective in today's classrooms. In some programs, aspiring teachers learn through lectures from professors who have not recently practiced in or visited a K-12 classroom. Subject-matter courses may be disconnected from courses on teaching methods, which themselves are disconnected from courses on student learning and child development. When new teachers enter K-12 classrooms, some are unable to apply what they learned in isolated, decontextualized preparation classes. A number of programs have also been criticized because they do not provide adequate time for candidates to learn subject matter, child development, learning theory, and effective teaching strategies; segment integrated professional skills into separate courses; insulate subject-matter faculties in the arts and sciences from education professors; and continue to view the work of teachers as undertaken in isolation rather than collaboratively.[13]

In general, high-quality teacher preparation programs are those that *link* components of teacher candidate experience—across higher education and K-12 clinical experiences and across education and arts and sciences course work—and that insist upon high standards in knowledge and practice among their graduates. But building the linkages required for high-quality teacher preparation cannot be done by the preparation program alone; on the contrary, it requires the cooperation of many institutions and agencies with an interest in teacher preparation. Education faculty, arts and sciences faculty, K-12 schools and districts, policymakers that govern K-12 and higher education, and others all have roles to play in building high-quality teacher preparation programs. The Study Group believes that **it is the role of the state to lead a K-16 institutional collaboration that ensures all teachers can bring students to high levels of learning. Policymakers enacting reforms intended to improve student achievement need to place teachers at the center of reform efforts and provide them with the knowledge and skills they need to help students achieve high standards.**

Barriers to a Coordinated System of High-Quality Teacher Preparation

If policymakers and practitioners are aware of the elements of effective teacher preparation and the striking effect of good teachers on student learning, why do there remain teacher preparation programs that fail to apply current knowledge of best

practice? While some fault certainly rests with the preparation programs themselves, the Study Group found that **the institutional and governance systems in which preparation programs operate consistently fail to support the type of systemic collaboration that reforms promoting "best practice" require.** There are at least three ways in which institutional and governance systems impede the development of high-quality teacher preparation, which are discussed in greater detail below:

- Disconnected institutional systems make it hard for K-12 and higher education institutions to collaborate around teaching and learning;
- Uncoordinated governance structures allow policymakers to develop conflicting policies and competing priorities across all levels of the education system; and
- A loose system of standards fails to join the work of practitioners and policymakers in a system-wide vision of good teaching and learning.

These three characteristics of the current institutional and governance environment of teacher preparation make building coherent standards, devising fair and rigorous accountability mechanisms, and coordinating the contribution of K-12, higher education, and policy communities inordinately difficult.

System and Institutional Disconnection. American K-12 and higher education systems are distinct and disconnected and have often worked at cross-purposes.[14] Yet teacher preparation lies at the nexus of K-12 and higher education, informed by the needs and required to meet the expectations of both: those preparing to be teachers must meet the expectations of their degree-granting institution to earn a degree but are then expected to perform according to different standards within the K-12 system. Conjoining two otherwise disconnected education systems, teacher preparation is an educational amalgam that serves many masters with varied purposes and expectations (see following page). As a result of this disconnect, arts and sciences faculty often provide subject-area courses with little connection to either K-12 standards or the teacher preparation curriculum in the college of education; institutions of higher education (IHEs) can develop preparation programs and grant degrees that bear little relation to what K-12 schools need in terms of teacher knowledge and skills; and information learned by teacher candidates during K-12 clinical experience can conflict with the content of their preparation program. The K-12 system and two-year and four-year institutions, which all make critical contributions to teacher preparation, have scant experience in joint planning and evaluation. Within colleges and universities, arts and sciences faculty are usually excluded from discussions of essential teacher knowledge and skills. Finally, accreditation standards and program approval requirements often fail to address the role of any higher education institutions other than the degree-granting institution in preparing teachers, even though a majority of teacher candidates complete their higher education at more than one school.

Uncoordinated Governance Structure. In most states, the creation of coherent policy for teacher preparation is stymied by a governance structure in

Program Approval v. Accreditation

Teacher preparation programs must meet one or more sets of criteria in order to prepare teachers. The first of these, **program approval criteria**, are public, established by the state board of education or state professional standards board, and are mandatory. **Accreditation standards** are criteria devised by a private accrediting agency, such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Adherence to accreditation standards is largely voluntary, except in states where policymakers have adopted accreditation as a requirement for program approval.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Teacher Preparation Policy Environment

Public perception of the education system

Accountability for student performance on state K-12 standards

Local districts
Induction
School district standards
Standardized tests
Union contracts

Teacher unions
Union contracts

Accreditation organizations
Accreditation/program quality
Articulation between arts and sciences and schools of education

State community college board
Transition from two-year to four-year institutions

State licensure board
Licensure/certification

State board of education
Accreditation/program quality
Certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
Induction
Program approval

Board of regents
Accreditation/program quality
Articulation between arts and sciences and schools of education

Policy concerning the coordination and accountability of teacher preparation programs involves many different players who are responsible for overseeing a number of interconnecting processes. All of this takes place within an environment of K-12 standards, accountability, and public perception.

State lawmakers
Certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
Induction
Licensure/certification
Standardized tests

which at least three separate policy boards oversee K-12 schools, two-year colleges, and four-year higher education institutions. In a growing number of states, teacher standards, licensure requirements, and program approval guidelines are established by another board that may have little relation to either the K-12 or higher education policy board. Additionally, universities are governed by their own autonomous boards. Affected by the priorities and agendas of so many disparate governance bodies, policies governing teacher preparation programs can be piecemeal and uncoordinated. Policy boards governing different levels of the education system rarely ensure that their work is mutually supportive. Though they lack clear lines of authority, legislators contribute to the muddle by adding teacher competency and course requirements via statute—yet this is generally done as a response to constituency concerns and is not based on knowledge about the best ways to prepare teachers. Universities find it hard to form coherent policies that meet the individual needs and agendas of all of their colleges, departments, and constituents, as well as the myriad requirements of different policy boards. Teacher unions, the governor, local districts, and other powerful constituents also can bring their own unique agendas to bear on the content and structure of teacher preparation.

Loose Standards. In a system characterized by disconnected institutions and governance structures, it is little wonder that a set of coherent standards that ties key system elements to the same goals, missions, and priorities has proven elusive. While virtually all K-12 systems in the country have developed standards for student knowledge and performance, higher education systems have resisted pressure to build system-wide standards. Furthermore, some state teacher licensure requirements establish expectations for individual teachers that are not reflected in the program approval requirements that apply to preparation programs. A host of other circumstances add to the challenge of setting coherent standards:

- Often K-12 standards have been developed with little input from higher education subject-area faculty or administrators, who consequently feel little responsibility to relate the state's K-12 standards to their own subject-area curriculum;
- Private teacher preparation accreditation defines program standards, but most teacher preparation programs have not pursued accreditation;
- State program approval requirements define program input and/or outcomes criteria but usually do so in terms of minimum competencies rather than high standards;
- Teacher licensure requirements measure new teacher knowledge and performance against indicators that may vary significantly both from the expectations established by K-12 standards and the knowledge and skill requirements of teacher preparation programs; and
- The system of higher education in which most teachers are prepared is not governed by the type of rigorous, clearly defined standards that K-12 schools and policymakers have come to expect. Ruled by intellectual autonomy and academic freedom, universities find it hard to establish campus-wide understandings of course content and rigor; more often than not, there is no standard way to coordinate course content and rigor among transfers from two- to four-year schools or among four-year schools.

Knowing key elements of effective teacher preparation is only the first step in building a coordinated, high-quality teacher preparation system. While states, accrediting agencies, and other private organizations have been developing teacher standards, assessment systems, and licensure criteria for several years, these efforts to systematically improve teacher preparation continue to fail because they lack the institutional and policy environments that program improvement requires. Reforms that address quality issues only *within* teacher preparation programs fundamentally miss the mark because effective teacher preparation, by its nature, requires cooperation among all levels of education, all groups of education policymakers, and all entities charged with overseeing and implementing standards. In other words, state and organizational efforts to

improve teacher preparation programs that focus solely upon the program cannot succeed because the job of preparing teachers clearly lies both inside and outside the preparation program. **Improving teacher preparation requires coordinated efforts across the system that foster excellence in all aspects of the preparation process—and accountability mechanisms that require it.**

Building a Coherent Teacher Preparation System

Building a coordinated, standards-based, and accountable system of teacher preparation requires collaboration on many fronts: between higher education institutions and K-12 schools; within and among higher education institutions; and between preparation programs and the states, districts, and schools that hire beginning teachers. It also requires mechanisms to make all collaborators accountable for their role in developing high-quality, effective teacher preparation. These issues, expanded upon below, form the backbone of this report, and subsequent chapters are devoted to exploring each topic in depth.

Linking Higher Education Institutions with K-12 Systems *(Chapter II).* Improving student achievement at all levels means that K-12 schools and institutions of higher education need to be intimately aware of and often involved in each others' work. Standards for student knowledge and performance at the K-12 level should reflect the knowledge and skills that IHEs need among entering freshmen, and standards in higher education—particularly in terms of teacher preparation—should reflect the needs of K-12 schools in terms of teacher pedagogical and content skills and knowledge. Furthermore, K-12 schools and IHEs need to work together to ensure that those preparing to be teachers have high-quality clinical experiences and current knowledge about the work of K-12 schools and that practicing teachers are aware of the most current, well-established research in teaching and learning.

Linking Programs, Departments, and Institutions within Higher Education *(Chapter III).* Colleges and universities generally comprise autonomous faculty, departments, and schools, and this tradition of autonomy is deeply embedded in the university culture. Within IHEs, colleges and departments need to work together to build pedagogical and content skills and knowledge among those preparing to be teachers. This means that IHEs must develop ways to distribute the responsibility for preparing teachers across departments and disciplines and build a community of service and research that values work with K-12 institutions. IHEs also need to develop campus-wide standards for those preparing to be teachers and ensure that all faculty involved in preparing teachers are accountable for their contributions. Finally, IHEs must bring *all* players in the higher education arena are brought to the table to ensure commitment to teacher preparation. While the precise list of players is complex and differs from state to state, critical participants include not only deans and university presidents, but also faculty leaders and members of the board of trustees; at the state level, the chancellor, members of the board of regents, and community college policymakers are key players.

Systems also must be built to ensure that new teachers, upon graduation, meet high standards regardless of where they have taken their content and pedagogy courses. As students grow increasingly likely to complete degree requirements at more than one IHE, it is important to devise shared standards and clear articulation agreements about course content and rigor among institutions. Only by building cross-institutional agreements can a state ensure that everyone involved in preparing teachers works from the same understandings about necessary content and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Linking Preparation Programs with the First Years of Teaching *(Chapter IV).* Novices' first years as teachers have a profound impact on their future careers. Often, new teachers feel overwhelmed and unable to translate what they learned in their preparation program to what they are expected to do on the job. To add to the challenge, employment structures that reward experienced teachers with the positions of their choice mean that new teachers often assume the most challenging positions: the percentage of new teachers teaching out of field is higher than among experienced teachers; disproportionate numbers of new teachers go to hard-to-serve schools; and novices commonly receive some of the most difficult teaching assign-

ments. Many new teachers report feeling discouraged and disillusioned. Although attrition among new teachers varies across states and districts, it is not unusual to find rates as high as 50 percent within the first five years.[15]

Providing programs that support teachers through their first years of teaching and that coordinate preparation and practice within a rubric of standards is one of the most effective ways to improve teachers' skills and expertise. Thus, states need to figure out how to provide the support novice teachers need in order to link their experience in preparation programs with the expectations of their job. Just as with pre-service preparation, states need to ensure that education and arts and sciences faculty, districts, and schools that hire beginning teachers are all involved in helping novice teachers transition from preparation to practice.

Making the System Accountable *(Chapter V).* Across the country, K-12 schools and students are being held accountable for the consequences of their work, and states and districts provide some combination of incentives for those who do well, supports for those who fall behind, and punitive measures for those who consistently fail to meet requirements. This is not the case for most teacher preparation programs, however, which are held to loose program approval requirements or judged on the basis of indirect measures of program quality, such as the percentage of their graduates who pass state licensure exams (such exams, in general, are designed to ensure minimum competency, not high quality). Similarly, program approval requirements have commonly focused upon program inputs rather than outcomes and have done little to drive quality upward.

State policymakers should seriously consider an evaluation system that holds preparation programs accountable for the ability of their graduates to demonstrate effective teaching practice and subject knowledge and improve student learning outcomes. Such a system needs to be fair and equitable, but it also needs to have clear consequences for those programs that consistently fail in their mission. Finally, policymakers need to find a way to hold *themselves* accountable for their responsibility to provide a policy framework that enables preparation programs to do their job well.

Conclusion: Outlining the Roadmap to an Effective Teacher Preparation System

Policymakers must work together, both informally and formally, to build bridges among different education levels; to define coherent, systemic standards for students, teachers, and teacher preparation programs; to align missions and goals across the system; and to articulate the needs of each constituent in terms of the work of the other. In other words, **policies and programs to support high-quality teacher preparation need to be coordinated in order to be effective.**

Chapter II

Coordinating K-12 and Higher Education to Support High-Quality Teacher Preparation

Teacher candidates learn best when the content and structure of their program of study in higher education closely corresponds with the experiences they have in K-12 schools during their preparation. But in years past, most state policies for teacher preparation have done little to link daily life in K-12 schools to the content or structure of preparation programs. Nor have they articulated the symbiotic relationship between the quality of teaching and learning in K-12 schools and in institutions of higher education (IHEs). For example:

- New teacher licensure requirements have often emphasized paper-and-pencil tests of content knowledge and evidence of course completion over evaluations of actual instructional skills of teachers in K-12 classrooms, which sends a message that the quality of practice doesn't matter;
- State policies do not require sufficient clinical experience in schools; in about 20 states, teacher candidates need to complete 10 or fewer weeks of student teaching in K-12 schools before becoming licensed, even though several national organizations recommend clinical experiences of at least twice that length;[16] and
- State program approval requirements generally have not required preparation programs to articulate the relationship between program components and K-12 student standards, nor have they commonly stipulated the need for college and university personnel from across the institution to systematically become involved in K-12 education.

The primary reason why policies concerning teacher preparation and K-12–higher education collaboration have failed to represent the best knowledge about learning to teach effectively is that most states have not developed a comprehensive, coordinated vision of teaching and learning that begins in kindergarten and continues through the undergraduate curriculum. It is little wonder, then, that states have historically had only a vague idea of what standards their teachers should meet, which preparation programs foster excellent practice among teachers, or what the appropriate relationship between K-12 schools and teacher preparation programs should be. The Study Group believes that **higher education institutions, K-12 schools, and the policymakers who govern both systems need to recognize and articulate the role each plays in the success of the others and coordinate their missions, goals, policies, and practices to prepare teachers who can bring students to high levels of achievement.**

Building teacher preparation programs that link the resources of higher education institutions and K-12 schools to improve teacher quality requires action on several fronts. First, it requires K-12 and higher education institutions to plan together to ensure that those preparing to be teachers have an opportunity to come into contact with all of the knowledge, skills, and experiences they will need in order to be effective. This means that colleges of education need to build an intimate knowledge of K-12 content and performance standards into their curriculum. It also requires K-12 and higher education institutions to devise long-term, clearly articulated experiences for those preparing to be teachers that are coordinated with the subject and pedagogical knowledge they are

learning. Not only do teachers need to be able to connect theory and content knowledge with real-life experience in schools, but university faculty need to be able to do so as well. In this way, faculty are more likely to provide targeted, meaningful, educative experiences for those preparing to be teachers. These issues are expanded upon in the sections below.

Coordinating Standards between Higher Education and K-12 Institutions

Standards that define the knowledge and skills of elementary and secondary students are also the foundation for everything that happens in higher education. They describe what knowledge and skills colleges and universities can expect arriving freshmen to possess, and they clearly define what knowledge and skills new teachers should be able to foster in K-12 students. Because of the central position of K-12 standards in both K-12 and higher education institutions, a coordinated system of teacher preparation cannot be built in isolation from K-12 standards.

Teacher education programs also need their own standards that clearly define the knowledge and skills expected of their graduates. These standards need to be largely "outcomes based," meaning that they define teacher accomplishments in terms of the extent to which they help students meet K-12 standards. They also need to represent high expectations, rather than minimum competencies, for teacher candidates. Finally, they need to be measurable in order to form a foundation for an appropriate accountability system. Some states have adopted standards for beginning teachers such as those

Building Participation in a Collaboration

One of the greatest challenges in undertaking a large-scale collaboration occurs at its onset: convincing the critical members to participate. State policymakers that want to foster collaboration to build a coordinated K-16 teacher preparation system should understand that effective collaboration is almost never a coerced undertaking. On the contrary, building collaboration requires leadership that can *persuade* potential partners that it is in their interest to participate. In fostering collaborative participation, leaders may:

- Emphasize shared goals;
- Focus upon how each potential collaborative member will benefit from the collaboration;
- Provide resources to cover staff time, travel, and any other activities related to the collaboration; and
- Enlist the support of key figures early and use their endorsement to encourage others to participate.

Ultimately, the strength of any collaboration depends upon the quality and diversity of its membership. Consequently, securing the participation of a wide array of members who are leaders in their fields and who are capable of spearheading change is an important first step to any successful collaboration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC); fewer states have developed accountability systems for teachers and preparation institutions that are tied to teacher performance as demonstrated by student achievement. Even fewer have devised ways to ensure that preparation programs build their content and structure around standards that represent the most effective ways of bringing students to high standards.

Coordinating Teacher Candidate Experience in K-12 and Higher Education Institutions

Both individuals preparing to be teachers and those who prepare them need to be involved in the day-to-day work of K-12 schools. Not only does work in K-12 schools give everyone a vested interest in the schools' successes, but it is also a critical way to develop intimate knowledge of what teaching in a K-12 school entails. Because the ability to link pedagogy and practice is a key element of good teaching, it is in the interests of candidates, programs, and K-12 schools to provide extensive K-12 experience to candidates that is coordinated with the courses offered by the preparation program.

Clinical experiences in K-12 schools that are coordinated with the teacher preparation curriculum are effective ways to prepare teachers for several reasons:

- They give teacher candidates consistent, long-term opportunities to apply theory to practice;
- They give university faculty the opportunity to evaluate teacher candidates' ability to apply theory to practice; and
- They encourage experienced teachers to mentor teacher candidates.

An increasingly popular way to foster K-12–higher education collaboration for the purpose of teacher preparation is through the development of *professional development schools (PDSs)*. Based upon the model of a teaching hospital in the medical profession, professional development schools foster cooperative work among teachers, administrators, university faculty, and teacher preparation students to influence the development of their profession, to increase the relevance of their work across all education levels, and to undertake shared deliberation on issues of student learning. In a PDS, school and university faculty share teaching responsibilities for both K-12 students and teacher candidates, collaborate on research concerning teaching practice, and cooperatively supervise and advise prospective teachers and administrators. PDSs also provide professional development for both new and experienced teachers and develop research about teaching. Although most PDSs are relatively new, preliminary research suggests that they may be effective ways to reform both public schools and teacher preparation simultaneously by encouraging a flow of information about needs, expectations, and best practices across levels. There has also been some work in the development of standards for professional development schools, most notably by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (see Appendix A).

In addition to developing PDSs, other teacher preparation programs have begun to require longer, more integrated student teaching experiences of their teacher preparation candidates. Some universities that offer these programs provide on-site classes during student teaching in order to provide candidates with a tangible opportunity to relate theoretical learning to their experiences in schools. In other states, K-12 collaboration with teacher preparation programs is fostered through clinical experience prior to student teaching. In Ohio, for example, although there is no statewide coordinated system of professional development schools, teacher candidates must complete at least 300 hours of field or clinical experience before they begin student teaching. Of course, collaboration among institutions is defined by more than a set number of hours of field experience; in Ohio, several individual colleges and

State Programs in K-16 Collaboration

Several states have developed effective collaborative programs between K-12 and higher education institutions. For example, Maryland's Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16 is a voluntary alliance of the Maryland State Department of Education, the Maryland Higher Education Commission, and the University System of Maryland. It develops strategies for strengthening K-16 connections, standards, competencies, assessments, professional development of educators, and community engagement in educational activities. In a bold departure from traditional education reform, the three institution heads agree that the education of Maryland's citizens is a shared responsibility of the three institutions. The Partnership is supported by a Council consisting of corporate, civic, and public and private education leaders who help implement an agenda to improve student achievement. To facilitate the direction of the Council, a K-16 Workgroup comprising representatives from businesses, communities, and public and nonpublic education meets regularly to share cross-institutional information, seek solutions to articulation issues, and collaborate on promising practices that improve student success.

In another instance, in 1995 Georgia's Governor Zell Miller tapped 38 leaders from around the state to serve on Georgia's P-16 Council and coordinate the state's P-16 Initiative. Members include representatives from the legislature, public schools, technical institutes, colleges and universities, health and human services professionals, individuals from the private sector, and students. The Council reports to the governor, state superintendent of schools, chancellor of the University System of Georgia, and commissioner of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. The six goals of the Initiative are:

- To improve the achievement of Georgia's students at all levels of education, pre-school through post-secondary programs;
- To help students move smoothly from one educational sector to another;
- To ensure that all students who enter post-secondary education are prepared to succeed, and to increase the success rate of those who enter;
- To close the gaps in access to post-secondary education between students from majority and minority groups and between students from high- and low-income groups;
- To link fundamentally teacher education, the public schools, and local communities in educational reform that brings P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of achievement; and
- To help students become more responsible in their citizenship.

The Initiative's success depends on the work of 14 local Community Councils, each including one public four-year institution, one or more community colleges, and several P-12 schools. These local councils articulate transfer standards for course work from two- to four-year schools, include higher education and P-12 schools in the work of preparing teachers, and involve higher education institutions in the job of bringing all P-12 students to high standards. Officials from the University System of Georgia are phasing in higher admissions standards for the 34 public colleges and universities to break a cycle of low admissions expectations.

Action toward achieving the long-term goals of the P-16 Initiative at both the state and local levels focuses on the following essential elements: high standards for all, from pre-school through post-secondary education; curricular linkages across all levels of public education; applied learning that links academic knowledge to real-world experiences; effective teaching at all levels to help students achieve the standards that apply to them; collective responsibility among all P-16 faculty to ensure that no student moves to the next level without first meeting performance expectations for the standards of the current level; data-based change; and co-reform of teacher education, advanced educator preparation programs, and P-12 schools to encourage practices that result in all children and youth meeting high academic standards.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

universities have used the clinical experience requirement as an opportunity to forge meaningful relationships with local K-12 schools and build coordinated teacher preparation programs that inextricably combine school experience with university course work.

Building Commitment among University Faculty to Teaching and Learning in K-12 Schools

Not only do teacher candidates need to have consistent, focused experience in K-12 schools, but evidence suggests that teacher preparation curricula are enhanced when university faculty have recent, substantial experience researching, teaching, or collaborating with staff in K-12 schools. In essence, even the most accomplished university faculty cannot teach what they do not know, and so teaching about life in schools, the daily work of teachers, and bringing K-12 students to high standards is best done by faculty with experience in these areas. Yet at most universities, faculty tenure and promotion requirements emphasize creating knowledge (in terms of completing and disseminating original research in a content area) rather than applying it, as in the case of working in K-12 schools.

The Public Schools Rewards Project, a collaborative effort by four universities to give faculty participation in K-12 education a clear place in the university faculty rewards system, has pointed out several issues that must be considered when revamping higher education rewards systems to encourage faculty participation in K-12 education and the preparation of teachers.[17] Lessons learned included:

- **External events can clearly affect changes in a university's conceptualization of its faculty roles and rewards system.** For example, in Colorado, recent legislation required universities to review and redesign faculty rewards systems that opened the door on many campuses for faculty work in K-12 schools.

- **Commitment from institutional leadership makes a difference in the extent and pace of change.** Commitments from leadership foster changes more efficiently than commitment that exists only within departments. The clear involvement of campus presidents, deans, and provosts, as well as faculty leaders, chief academic officers, and trustees, can make or break K-16 collaboration.

- **Existing relationships among external and internal partners and an institution's predisposition to span boundaries facilitate the start and pace of change.** Established partnerships between K-12 and university groups and with the community can facilitate internal change in a university. Also, universities with a tradition of separation between faculties and between the institution and the community are less likely to foster effective collaboration.

- **An institution's view of itself with respect to the community in which it lives, often reflected in an institution's mission statement, affects the degree to which faculty recognize the work of the community as their work.** Institutions with significant community roles are more likely to see work with K-12 schools as part of their work and are more likely to reward that work. Temple University has been particularly effective at fostering community work among faculty.

- **The preexisting status of interdisciplinary work on the campus affects the tendencies of the faculty to link the disciplines and education in ways that are essential to the substantive reform of teacher education.**

- **Access to financial resources to support faculty participation in community work makes a significant difference in the level of faculty involvement, as does the use of financial rewards to support departmental efforts, rather than individual efforts, with K-12 partners.**

- **Messages that new members of a culture receive about the norms of that culture reveal a great deal about the chances a particular cause has for acceptance.** Faculty who learn, upon arrival at an institution, that collaboration with K-12 schools is a way of life are likely to build that into their work;

conversely, faculty who learn that more traditional demonstrations of scholarly work are the route to tenure pursue traditional research activities.

Universities that take seriously their commitment to K-12 education need to think hard about ways to build a parallel sense of commitment in their faculty as well, and they need to reward them for doing so. This may require universities to revamp tenure policies to clearly reward research and service in K-12 schools. It may also require universities to build institutional relationships with local K-12 schools that extend beyond those for the purposes of preparing teachers.

Conclusion: The Importance of Leadership in Fostering Collaboration

School–university collaboration is becoming an increasingly expected component of effective teacher preparation. For example, the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act stipulated that federal funds can only be distributed to schools of education that are partnered with colleges of arts and sciences and with K-12 schools. Several states are developing professional development school initiatives, such as Maryland, which requires all teacher candidates to complete a one-year internship in a professional development school prior to initial certification. Some states, for program approval, require evidence that candidates have extended clinical experience that relates to content and pedagogical knowledge. Both NCATE and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) require evidence of linking pedagogical and content knowledge with practice in K-12 schools, although their methods of doing so vary in several aspects (see Appendices B and C).

But building linkages between K-12 and higher education, as well as the policy bodies that govern both systems, can be challenging. The diffusion of responsibility for different levels of education across several policy boards, combined with the independent nature of institutions of higher education, means that no one group can compel or coerce another to collaborate. Rather, collaboration to link K-12 schools with teacher preparation programs needs to be fostered through the clear, persuasive articulation of shared concerns across education levels and policy boards. In other words, effectively challenging deeply rooted divisions between K-12 schools and

Private Efforts to Link K-12 Schools and University-Based Teacher Preparation Programs

In addition to several promising state programs to develop K-16 continuity, private collaboratives are also helping to bridge the gap between K-12 schools and teacher preparation programs at higher education institutions. For example, the Holmes Partnership, a national coalition of university education deans, public schools, and teachers' unions, operates the Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education (UNITE). UNITE members have formed 33 sites across the country that bring colleges of education together with P-12 schools to engage in simultaneous, closely aligned renewal of teacher education, specifically for urban schools.

Another example is the Design for Excellence: Linking Teaching and Achievement (DELTA) collaborative, an initiative of the Los Angeles Annenberg Metropolitan Project. The collaborative includes four P-12 school families linked to four state universities that serve as "professional development centers for preservice, induction, and inservice experiences."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Elements of Effective Collaboration

Bringing various groups into a collaboration, each with different purposes and agendas, can be very hard work. In order to develop an environment that helps new partners work together around a new, common agenda, general thinking about effective collaboration suggests that several elements need to be put in place:

Endorsement. Vague slogans in favor of collaboration are ineffective; leaders must spell out in detail why they believe collaboration is important and encourage other collaborative partners to endorse the undertaking as well.

Effective leadership. For collaborative teams to be effective, leadership must be broadly distributed among the constituent groups so that each group feels they have an important place in the collaboration but no single group is unduly burdened.

Latitude for influence. All involved groups need to be included in the development of the goals and objectives of the collaborative effort. Teaming for the sake of teaming leads to disillusionment; teams should be created to deal with matters of compelling importance.

Time. Opportunities for collaborative work are either enhanced or eroded by a master schedule that allows appropriate time for the work of the collaboration to be done. Furthermore, all involved groups must be able to commit time to the collaboration. Sometimes, this may require financial and other resources to allow all groups to commit time and personnel to the endeavor.

Training and assistance. Cooperative work may place unfamiliar demands on those participating. Task-related training, assistance, and facilitation may help participants master the specific skills needed for collaboration, develop explicit agreements to govern their work together, and gain confidence in their ability to work with one another.

Material support. The quality and availability of reference texts and other materials, consultants on selected problems, adequate logistic and office supplies, and other forms of human and material support are crucial to support individuals' ability and willingness to work together successfully.[18]

In states where effective K-16 collaboration has been fostered, several other key program characteristics are usually shared:

- All of the stakeholders are brought to the table early. This means convening joint meetings of K-12 and higher education policymakers and practitioners on a regular basis;
- Members of collaborative teams are key decision makers in the field who are able to leverage change;
- At least in the beginning, effective collaboration focuses upon meeting specific, manageable outcomes;
- Collaborative entities have clearly defined, appropriate resources allocated to accomplish their desired outcomes;
- Collaboratives have clear plans either for terminating or creating structures to make permanent a collaboration; and
- Effective collaborations usually have methods for evaluating the effectiveness of the collaboration.

institutions of higher education requires dynamic leadership that can persuade leaders from both the K-12 and higher education communities that it is in their interest to collaborate.

While many K-12 schools and universities have developed the necessary leadership and formed partnerships independent of state support, **the Study Group believes that it is the role of the state to lead K-16 institutional collaboration.*** This not only requires doing what is necessary to convene education governance leaders at the state level but also building leadership capacity among higher education and K-12 administrators. These administrators should be those who are already leaders in their field and have the vision and respect necessary to move teacher preparation to the center of the institutional agenda; for universities, this includes the presidents, vice presidents or provosts of targeted universities, and for K-12 schools, this includes respected principals and superintendents of reform-minded schools and districts. Within particular states, leadership from other entities, such as teacher unions, may be an important addition to the collaboration.

State Actions to Consider

To address system and institutional disconnection:

- Use state program approval as leverage to require meaningful, long-term, coordinated practical experiences in K-12 schools for all individuals preparing to be teachers.
- Develop incentives for universities to reconsider tenure and incentive policies that fail to reward faculty for work in K-12 public schools.
- Provide incentives for developing professional development schools and other methods of joining K-12 and higher education institutions.
- Make resources available to support collaboration among K-12 and higher education policymakers, administrators, and faculty.

To address uncoordinated governance structures:

- Lead a coordinated effort among state policymakers to ensure that programs and policies across K-12 and higher education are clearly articulated in relation to each other.

To address lack of standards:

- Ensure that faculty and administration from higher education institutions participate centrally in any state discussion of K-12 standards.
- Work with other governing bodies to ensure that K-12 student content and performance standards form the backbone of teacher preparation standards.

*In some states, the term "P-16" is used to denote cooperative arrangements that include early childhood education. Because in most states early childhood education is not overseen by an education policymaking body, the Study Group has chosen to use "K-16" throughout this report. The use of this term, however, is not intended to diminish the importance of early childhood education as one component of a coordinated system nor suggest that early childhood educational institutions and policymakers cannot contribute significantly to a coordinated education system.

Chapter III

Building Linkages within Higher Education to Support High-Quality Teacher Preparation

Those involved in education know that good teachers have both pedagogical and subject-area knowledge and that they can link these types of knowledge to devise high-quality learning experiences that foster student achievement. Indeed, negotiating the relationship between content and pedagogy is one of the central components of good teaching.

Within academe, then, the job of preparing teachers rests not only with the school of education but with faculty and administrators across the institution. Yet on most university campuses, linkages among colleges, departments, and often individual faculty are rare and unsupported. In terms of teacher education, this means that programs are commonly defined along two parallel tracks. The first, overseen by the school of education, defines the overall program design, teaching methods courses, and field experience structure and requirements. Arts and sciences faculty provide content-area courses to teacher candidates, usually in complete isolation from the curriculum of the education school. Under this organizational system, content-area knowledge is presented as distinct from pedagogical knowledge, and, although teacher candidates cross the divide between the two tracks daily, the two faculties rarely communicate, much less undertake any joint planning. Consequently, there is no way to ensure that content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and field experience align to form a coherent program of study to prepare individuals to be effective teachers.

Not only have IHEs failed to build linkages across faculty and administration within their institutions, but they have not devised standards for students who move from one higher education institution to another. The reality is that most college students attend more than one IHE before receiving a degree. However, colleges and universities often lack clear articulation agreements with nearby institutions, allowing students to move from one institution to another in ways that can jeopardize the quality or coherence of their academic program.

Ultimately, institutions of higher education and education policymakers need to devise ways to "move teacher education beyond the confines of a single department or college and raise it to the institutional level" by building linkages both *within* and *across* higher education institutions.[19] This collaboration needs to articulate student teacher standards across faculty, courses, and departments and encourage faculty commitment to teacher preparation throughout the entire institution. The Study Group believes that building these linkages requires action on several fronts:

- Developing shared standards across colleges of education and arts and sciences for the content and rigor of teacher candidate knowledge;
- Acknowledging the critical role of arts and sciences faculty in developing content knowledge in teacher candidates;
- Increasing regard for high-quality teaching among faculty by devising tenure and promotion criteria that promote teaching; and
- Devising standards-based articulation agreements across IHEs to ensure that teacher candidates who complete their course work at more than one institution receive seamless, high-quality preparation.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to exploring these issues in depth.

The Project 30 Alliance

The Project 30 Alliance was developed in 1988 with a grant from the Carnegie Corporation and support from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences Deans (CCAS). It was the first organization to focus exclusively upon the relationship between arts and sciences and education. In more than ten years, it has developed a five-point intellectual agenda for teacher education that requires the full collaboration of faculty from arts and sciences with faculty in education.

Subject-matter understanding. Teachers must be well-grounded in the academic areas they teach. But the typical course in an academic major may not yield the kind of understanding prospective teachers need to have to communicate knowledge effectively to their students. Arts and sciences faculty must pursue redesigns that ensure conceptual subject-matter understanding and penetrating comprehension of the interrelationships among disciplines.

General and liberal education. Teachers should be well-educated. Indeed, it is the teacher's command of general knowledge, and the display of a quality of mind associated with liberal learning, that can entitle the teacher to be called professional. Well-educated teachers bring a dignity and respect to the profession that can help return teaching to its proper place on the list of career alternatives students consider.

Pedagogical content knowledge. Teaching is the art of constructing a bridge between the teacher's content knowledge and the implicit understanding brought to the situation by the learner. Serious consideration of how to engage young people in learning naturally leads to reflection on methods of teaching college students. Many arts and sciences faculty have very little formal background in the art of teaching their disciplines, and few have opportunities to discuss seriously the most appropriate methods or effective metaphors to convey a concept.

International, cultural, and other human perspectives. The college curriculum must be accurate with respect to recent scholarship on matters of race, gender, ethnicity, and cultural perspective. In the global economy, it is important for Americans to learn other languages and comprehend other cultures. Consequently, prospective teachers should have knowledge of other nations, languages, and cultures, and teacher education programs should be infused with multicultural perspectives.

Recruitment of underrepresented groups into teaching. While all teachers can provide positive support for diverse students, a balanced representation of minority teachers will increase numbers of culture-specific role models who can encourage minority students to pursue a college degree and consider a broad spectrum of subject areas. Ways of attracting and retaining more minority teachers should be incorporated into teacher education programs.

Currently, 23 universities are members of Project 30, both public and private, large and small, and some that serve traditionally minority populations.

For more information about the Project 30 Alliance, view its website, www.project30.org.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Alternate Routes to Teacher Licensure as Part of a Coordinated Teacher Preparation System

More and more, teacher candidates are receiving their preparation in programs that look very different than traditional, four-year undergraduate programs. Often called "alternate routes to licensure," these programs serve mid-career changers and other types of non-traditional candidates. They are offered by a variety of organizations and institutions, including school districts, universities, and non-profit and for-profit organizations. More importantly, alternate routes to licensure can be very effective at preparing teachers, particularly when they:

- Are at least nine months to one year in duration;
- Include strong pedagogical and academic course work that is tied to state standards; and
- Provide intensive, closely supervised clinical experience.

Although some policymakers and practitioners fear that a proliferation of diverse routes to becoming a teacher may dilute the quality of teacher candidates, the Study Group believes that, in an outcomes-based system of accountability that holds all preparation programs responsible for the knowledge and performance of their graduates, alternate routes to licensure can be effective ways to enlarge the teaching pool without compromising quality. It is critical, however, to ensure quality among alternate routes is maintained in the same way that it is ensured among traditional programs. This means that all approved alternate routes are held to the same outcomes as other preparation programs, evaluated as rigorously as other programs, and included in collaboration for teacher improvement.

For more information about alternate routes, see Barnett Berry's article in NASBE's Winter 2000 edition of the *State Education Standard*, "Quality Alternatives in Teacher Preparation."

Developing Shared Standards in Institutions of Higher Education

While standards have sometimes been adopted as a result of accreditation procedures or program approval requirements (depending upon whether the preparation program is accredited and what the actual state program approval requirements are), the Study Group believes that it is incumbent upon every college and university administrator to collaborate with policymakers, K-12 schools, and other IHEs to consciously decide what the standards are to complete a teacher preparation program, who among the faculty plays a role in helping candidates achieve these standards, how faculty and candidates will be held accountable for their role in meeting standards, and what incentives, supports, or punitive measures are appropriate. Any discussion of university standards for teacher preparation programs should include:

- Devising ways in which the teacher preparation curriculum is informed by K-12 content and performance standards;
- Building departmental, if not institution-wide, consensus for syllabi in key undergraduate courses;
- Developing a clear evaluation system that traces specific student outcomes to the contribution of specific classes and/or faculty; and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Devising clear mechanisms to hold arts and sciences responsible for teacher education outcomes in the same way that education faculty are held accountable.

The Study Group believes that university faculty leaders and administrators need to play an important role in overseeing the development of standards for higher education courses and degrees. It is the role of policymakers, on the other hand, to develop a policy environment in which universities can be encouraged to do the difficult work of setting standards. Micromanaging university curricula through state policy levers should be approached cautiously, as such actions could be an inappropriate use of resources that infringes upon the positive consequences of maintaining an independent academe. **Much as they have done with K-12 schools, however, state policymakers can devise clear and specific outcomes measures for teacher candidates and hold higher education institutions responsible for the outcomes of their preparation programs through high-quality and comprehensive evaluation criteria that are tied to program approval.** In other words, policymakers need to focus upon measuring the outcomes of university degree programs, intervening when outcomes do not meet standards, and fostering a statewide investment in building standards for higher education. The process of undergraduate education, however, is the business of higher education institutions and faculty. In this way, states can reconcile their need to ensure programmatic rigor and high standards with their respect for academic freedom.

Recognizing the Importance of Arts and Sciences Faculty in Teacher Preparation

Evidence makes clear that teachers need to not only be steeped in their subject matter, but they need to be able to think about their subject matter pedagogically. In other words, both education and arts and sciences faculty play an important role in preparing teachers to link content with pedagogy. For too long, however, education faculty have shouldered the blame for the content-knowledge shortcomings of practicing teachers, when imparting subject-area knowledge is largely the responsibility of arts and sciences, rather than education, faculty.

Encouraging arts and sciences and education faculty to collaborate to prepare teachers is a revolutionary idea on some campuses. But **the Study Group believes that developing high-quality teachers requires the clear commitment and strong collaboration of both education and arts and sciences faculty. Consequently, policymakers and university administrators need to invest in building a campus-wide commitment to teacher preparation.** This means, first and foremost, that arts and sciences faculty need to have a sense of ownership over the quality of education provided to subject-area teacher candidates. They also need to feel responsible for the quality of K-12 teaching that occurs in their field. Finally, they need to be included in discussion of K-12 curricular content and the knowledge teachers need to undergird delivery of this curriculum.

Some universities have found effective ways to include arts and sciences faculty in a campus-wide commitment to preparing high-quality teachers. For example, at the University of Northern Colorado, all arts and sciences faculty are expected to commit to service in local schools, and most arts and sciences faculty also teach classes to students in the university's teacher preparation program. At Millersville University of Pennsylvania, content courses provided by arts and sciences faculty serve as pedagogical examples that are analyzed by teacher candidates as a part of their preparation program. Administrators at Millersville have found that, rather than building tension, encouraging teacher candidates to critique and analyze the teaching techniques of arts and sciences faculty has opened constructive dialogue across campus about effective pedagogy and critical content knowledge.

Arts and sciences faculty must not only be given a sense of ownership over the quality of teacher candidates produced by the university, but they need to be accountable for the role they play in developing content knowledge among those preparing to be teachers. **While state policymakers have often focused program improvement efforts on redefining program approval standards, these standards have normally centered around the aspects of the preparation program that are housed within the college of education. If states expect colleges of**

The Renaissance Group

A consortium of universities called the Renaissance Group was created in 1989 to improve the education of teachers and to facilitate efforts to reform teacher education nationally. The Renaissance Group adopted 12 key principles that it believes undergird effective teacher education programs. These principles are both statements of best practice and objectives to be achieved at member colleges and universities. Working alone and also collaboratively with others, Renaissance Group universities are experimenting with innovative educational models. They are developing new curricula, teaching strategies, and textbooks as well as undertaking studies to assist public policymakers and educational leaders.

The Group requires that the president, academic vice-president, and education dean at each campus be actively involved in its work. Such a representative leadership structure helps mobilize university-wide support for the education of teachers.

Principles of the Renaissance Group include:

Teacher education is an all-campus responsibility;

Programs for the preparation of teachers thrive in a university culture that values quality teaching;

Decisions concerning the education of teachers are the shared responsibility of the university faculty, practitioners, and other related professionals;

The preparation of teachers is integrated across a student's university experience and is not segmented or reserved to the student's final year;

The appropriate role of the state is to establish outcome expectations for teacher education graduates; the appropriate role of the university is to determine the curriculum, standards, and internal policies for teacher education programs;

Rigorous learning expectations and exit requirements characterize the program to educate teachers;

The academic preparation of teachers includes a rigorous general education program, in-depth subject-matter preparation, and general and content-specific preparation in teaching methodology;

Teacher education programs reflect American diversity and prepare graduates to teach in a pluralistic and multicultural society;

The education of teachers incorporates extensive and sequenced field and clinical experiences;

Teacher preparation programs have faculty who are active in scholarly and professional endeavors;

The continuing professional development of teachers and other education personnel is the shared responsibility of the university faculty and other education professionals; and

Programs to educate teachers for the new world have sufficient support to implement these principles.

For more information about the Renaissance Group, view its website at www.uni.edu/coe/ren_grp/index.html.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

arts and sciences to participate constructively in teacher preparation, they need to acknowledge the critical role of arts and sciences faculty. This may include developing policies that:

- Require the results of content-area licensure exams to be analyzed in light of course standards and curricula in both education and arts and sciences;
- Clearly define in program approval requirements the state's expectations for arts and sciences faculty participation; and
- Require evidence of education and arts and sciences faculty collaboration around questions of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge.

Overall, state policymakers across the system need to work together to help colleges and universities articulate expected discipline knowledge among teacher candidates and hold both the candidates and the education and arts and sciences faculties responsible for meeting them.

Encouraging Faculty Respect for the Practice of Teaching

Universities often find it hard to form coherent institutional policies that meet the individual needs and agendas of all of their colleges and departments. For example, university tenure and promotions policies often value research above teaching and community work. Evaluation schemes may also categorize faculty accomplishments, for the purpose of evaluation, into discrete categories of "research," "teaching," and "community service," which makes it hard to adequately reward faculty work, such as much of the work done in K-12 schools, that bridges all three categories. While these policies have arguably led to exceptionally high standards of individual scholarship among faculty, they make it difficult to adequately reward the types of community-based scholarship that may be most appropriate in applied fields such as education. Relatedly, common university promotions policies that encourage departments to place their most inexperienced faculty in teaching-intensive positions (and allow seasoned and highly esteemed faculty to "rank out" of teaching into research-intensive jobs) can perpetuate the low status of teaching and fail to reward those faculty who foster precisely the kind of practical experiences that teacher candidates need. Consequently, the Study Group believes that colleges and universities that are serious about high-quality teaching need to ensure that this is reflected in their faculty tenure and promotions policies.

Devising Standards-Based Articulation Agreements across Institutions of Higher Education

About two-thirds of those preparing to be teachers transfer credits from one higher education institution to another, and more than 20 percent of those who will be teachers begin their higher education at community colleges.[20] For candidates who transfer credits from one institution to another, degree-granting institutions often grant credit for a course based on little more than a class title, reading list, or syllabus. The high level of mobility among those preparing to be teachers, and the lack of clear standards for transferring courses from one campus to another, can upset program coherence and make it difficult for the degree-granting institution to ensure that candidates have the content and pedagogical knowledge they need in order to teach effectively.

In some states, regulations actually require public institutions of higher education to accept transfer credits of students coming from other state institutions. The Study Group strongly believes that such regulations effectively deny institutions of higher education important authority to regulate students' academic programs and do not place institutions in positions where they can be reasonably held accountable for student outcomes. Without an effective way to monitor the content and rigor of transfer courses, universities find that they are granting degrees in teacher preparation to students about whom they have very little knowledge of discipline expertise. **States need to reconsider policies that require acceptance of transfer credits from one institution to another, encourage all higher education institutions to develop shared standards of course content and**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Role of Community Colleges in Teacher Preparation

Community colleges are a critically important, but often overlooked, component of any coordinated system of teacher preparation. Currently, community colleges enroll 44 percent of all U.S. undergraduates, and 46 percent of all first-time freshman attend community colleges. Even more important to states that seek diversity among their teaching corps, community colleges enroll 46 percent of all African American, 55 percent of all Hispanic, and 55 percent of all Native American students in higher education. Clearly, community colleges offer a tremendous pool of potential teacher candidates, and many individuals who plan to be teachers begin their academic careers at community colleges.

Not only do community colleges provide liberal arts preparation to large numbers of teacher candidates, but they do so at less cost to the student, in environments that tend to be close to students' homes, and with schedules that appeal to older, working individuals. Thus, incorporating community colleges into a collaborative system of teacher preparation is an important way to attract non-traditional candidates to the field. Recognizing the important role of community colleges in teacher preparation, several universities have begun to collaborate with local two-year schools.

- In Florida, the Duval County Public Schools, the Florida Community College at Jacksonville, and the University of North Florida worked together to improve access of minority students to careers in teaching, provide several early field experiences and mentoring, and facilitate matriculation across schools by developing shared course content.

- In Georgia, several colleges and universities that participate in regional P-16 collaboratives have worked with feeder community colleges to develop joint course syllabi in order to ensure that classes transferred from local community colleges contain the content knowledge required of the degree-granting institution.

- University of Houston–Clear Lake faculty members from education and arts and sciences have worked with a community college and staff from professional development schools on a "content alignment committee," which defined knowledge that beginning teachers must possess in English, mathematics, and social studies. The content plans devised by the committee were also aligned with national, state, and local standards. The result of this collaboration has been consensus around course content and a detailed transfer plan for students moving from the two-year to four-year institution.

Community colleges also provide promising models of accountability. In at least five states—California, Florida, Illinois, South Carolina, and Washington—public community colleges operate within a system of performance-based funding that holds them accountable for student outcomes. While the specifics of these programs vary from state to state, many are based upon clear standards, rely upon student outcomes to measure institutional success, use multiple measures, and combine measures of quality with measures of improvement over time to decide upon an institution's overall fitness.

rigor, and vest ultimate authority to accept or deny course transfers with the degree-granting institution.

States can also encourage institutions of higher education to form course articulation agreements with institutions from which students are likely to transfer. For articulation agreements to be meaningful, they must clearly define both the content and level of rigor expected for completion and transfer of any course and ensure that roughly equivalent courses are offered on participating campuses.

For transfer credits among institutions that have no articulation agreements, states can encourage degree-granting institutions to evaluate student knowledge and/or investigate course content and rigor by devising accountability systems that clearly hold degree-granting institutions accountable for the quality of their teacher candidates, regardless of where course credits were originally earned.

Conclusion: Reconciling the Responsibilities of the State and Academic Freedom

One of the traditional strengths of academe has been its tradition of independent thinking. It is important that efforts to encourage standards and build linkages across institutions respect this tradition. State policymakers should understand that intervening to help institutions collaborate for improved teacher preparation does not imply a "cookie cutter" approach to teacher preparation. On the contrary, it is the diversity of institutions that is their strength.

State policymakers can, however, find ways to help universities themselves adopt what they know to be best practices. Building horizontal and vertical linkages across the system of higher education makes good sense and helps universities themselves achieve their goal of producing well-prepared, intellectually promising graduates.

Ultimately, states need to step in where institutions fail to reach quality standards. It is the role of the state to make hard choices about academic freedom and academic rigor in situations where the two ideals conflict. A university structure that provides no clear standards, fails to foster commitment among faculty to K-12 education, and discourages collaboration among education and arts and sciences faculty is unlikely to develop high-quality teachers; in such cases, policymakers governing all levels of education need to work together to ensure needed change.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State Actions to Consider

To address system and institutional disconnection:

- Support university presidents and system heads as they work to change curricular, organizational, transfer, tenure, and promotions policies that encourage the development of high-quality teacher preparation programs.

- Encourage universities to develop rewards and tenure policies that keep teaching at the center of their work.

To address uncoordinated governance structures:

- Highlight the need for other state education governing bodies to develop programs that support faculty who are trying to change their work to better support those training to be teachers.

- Reconsider policies that require acceptance of transfer credits across schools and encourage degree-granting institutions to devise effective ways to evaluate the rigor of study required for each transfer request.

- Spearhead voluntary collaboration among higher education leaders and provide financial, material, and time resources for collaborative work.

To address lack of standards:

- Devise outcomes measures for preparation programs that hold both education and arts and sciences faculty responsible for their role in preparing high quality teachers.

- Expand the standards movement to colleges and universities, using the acknowledged problem of course transfers across schools as a way to open the door to talk about standards in higher education.

- Build collaborative efforts among K-16 policymakers to define the critical elements of campuses that support teacher preparation.

Chapter IV

Building a Coordinated System of New Teacher Support

In years past, most individuals involved in teacher education considered preparation over when the candidate earned a bachelor's degree and applied for a license to teach. This is no longer the case. More and more, states are requiring new teachers to formally continue to develop their practice through their first few years on the job.

Evidence has made clear that the first years of teaching are critical in developing good practice; under ideal circumstances, teachers spend much of the first two years of teaching improving their understanding of the links between content and pedagogy, becoming more familiar with K-12 content and performance

Teacher Induction in Connecticut

The promotion of high standards for teachers has been an integral component of Connecticut's education reform agenda since the mid-1980s. The Education Enhancement Act of 1986 raised standards for teacher education and licensing as well as increased teacher salaries to the highest in the nation.

The centerpiece of Connecticut's teacher improvement initiative is the comprehensive Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) Program, which aims to ensure that every Connecticut student is taught by a highly qualified teacher. This induction program is based upon a clear set of standards and has been approved by subject-area professional associations and the Connecticut Education Association as an effective tool to help new teachers develop high-quality practice. To accomplish its goals, BEST:

- Ties teacher standards to national standards of "best practice" and to the state's own student content and performance standards;
- Provides intensive mentorship experiences for new teachers; and
- Requires the completion of a portfolio evaluation over the course of two years by every new teacher practicing in the state.

Connecticut's innovative work in beginning teacher induction and portfolio assessments has attracted national attention, largely through Connecticut's participation in INTASC. The National Commission on Teaching & America's Future has also drawn attention to the policy, saying that teachers in Connecticut were "among the best prepared in the nation" as a result of BEST.

California's Teacher Induction Program

Established in 1992, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program (sponsored by the California Department of Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing) provides opportunities for a small percentage of fully prepared first- and second-year teachers to expand and deepen their teaching knowledge and skills. It also increases the retention of novice teachers and improves learning opportunities for K-12 students. Funded at a level of $72 million in 1999-2000, the program has grown extensively in recent years; in July of 1999 the program served over 23,000 first- and second-year teachers.

BTSA's content and structure are based upon a clear set of benchmarks for program quality, and the program operates with eight statutory purposes designed to:

- Provide an effective transition into teaching for first- and second-year teachers;
- Raise performance levels through improved training, information, and assistance;
- Enable effectiveness in teaching students who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse;
- Ensure professional success and retention of new teachers who show promise;
- Identify new teachers who need extra help;
- Improve the consistency and rigor of specific teacher performance assessments;
- Establish an effective and coherent system of performance assessments for teachers that is based upon the necessary skills, abilities, and knowledge of teaching; and
- Examine alternate ways to assure the public and the education field that new teachers who remain have attained acceptable levels of competence.

While in BTSA, new teachers develop an Individual Induction Plan (IIP) with the assistance of a support provider. In developing the IIP, the new teacher and support provider are informed by the results of a systematic formative assessment of the new teacher's practice in relation to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The formative assessment identifies teachers' areas of development and needed growth.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

standards, enlarging their repertoire of teaching techniques, and building a high level of comfort with the culture of their particular school. In fact, evidence suggests that programs to support teachers through their first years of teaching are one of the most effective ways to improve teacher skills and expertise because they give new teachers the support they need to develop the knowledge and skills required of them. Programs of support also help new teachers develop ever higher levels of professional practice, can improve retention, often help attract new teachers to a specific district or state, and increase teacher effectiveness across the board.[21]

Because of the promising outcomes of new teacher support systems (usually called "induction programs"), over half of all states currently require or plan to require induction for some or all of their new teachers, and 19 of those require all beginning teachers to complete an induction program. At least 13 states currently dedicate significant state funds to new teacher induction programs. Clearly, induction programs are becoming a fundamental component of many new teachers' preparation. Furthermore, the Study Group believes that teacher preparation programs, along with the K-12 schools in which new teachers work and within the structure of an organized

Building an Effective and Coordinated Induction Program

Effective new teacher induction programs share several characteristics. They:

- Are based upon the premise that beginning teachers are not finished products;
- Focus primarily upon providing support to new teachers;
- Include every beginning teacher in a state or district;
- Involve experienced teachers as mentors and encourage the entire school community to cultivate good teaching;
- Are based upon clear standards;
- Include a system to prepare mentors for their role;
- Have a structured educational program that is defined by the observations and requests of both beginning and mentor teachers;
- Are consistently supported by earmarked funding;
- Establish a system to evaluate new teachers according to clearly established standards;
- Put in place a system to measure their effectiveness;
- Extend beyond the first year of teaching; and
- Give new teachers working conditions that help them focus upon learning to teach, including reduced teaching loads, placements in teaching fields for which they are qualified, placements with students that provide average challenges to teachers, and participation in targeted professional development.

Source: C. L. Claycomb and W. D. Hawley, *Recruiting and Retaining Effective Teachers for Urban Schools: Developing a Strategic Plan for Action* (Washington, DC: National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching, 2000).

system of support, share primary responsibility for ensuring that a new teacher's transition from preparation to practice is a successful one. **State education policymakers, school district leaders, university education and arts and sciences faculty and administrators, and K-12 school faculty need to build a coordinated, accountable, standards-based system of new teacher support that bridges the gap between preparation and the first years of teaching practice.**

The Need for Programs to Support New Teachers

Despite what is known about the impressive outcomes of high-quality teacher induction programs, currently far too many teachers receive very little support when they enter the profession. To add to the difficulty of being new, unsupported teachers, they enter the profession in some of the most challenging positions possible. The percentage of new teachers teaching out of field is considerably higher than among experienced teachers. New teachers go disproportionately to hard-to-serve schools and commonly receive some of the most difficult teaching assignments. Many new teachers report feeling discouraged and disillusioned. High attrition rates among new teachers have been well documented, often as high as 50 percent within the first five years,[22] and there is some evidence that teachers with higher academic ability are more likely to leave.[23] But the results of good teacher induction can be profound, particularly when induction includes the participation of the preparing institution and is built around clear state standards for beginning teacher practice:

- Texas's induction year program provides support and induction to first-year teachers and focuses upon solving practical classroom issues. Faculty regularly visit participants' classrooms to evaluate the beginning teacher. In one Texas program at Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi, 100 percent of teachers have stayed on the job for at least five years, whereas the statewide retention rate of new teachers over the same period is about 50 percent.
- At the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill, professors provide problem-solving help to graduates during their first years as teachers. The program, called the Lighthouse Project, facilitates online conversations among new teachers and university faculty that help new teachers solve problems and hone skills. Simultaneously, it helps professors keep up-to-date on the challenges and issues that new teachers face on the job.

States that take seriously their commitment to ensuring high standards among their teachers need to figure out how to support novice teachers through a comprehensive induction program that is included in a coordinated system of teacher preparation. Such a program must be based upon K-12 standards and expand upon the work of the preparation program. It should also include a clear role for the preparing institution, not only because doing so helps new teachers link preparation with practice, but also because program involvement in teacher induction pulls college and university faculty into the K-12 experiences of their graduates and helps to solidify the link between preparation programs and K-12 schools.

Several states have made progress in bringing preparation programs to the task of inducting new teachers. Texas, for example, requires all preparation programs to be involved in regional induction of their graduates, and 10 states require preparation institutions to do some type of follow-up with their teacher preparation graduates. In Georgia, this includes a recently instituted "guarantee" that requires institutions to take back for further training any teacher candidate who fails to achieve the state standard in content knowledge or performance (see Appendix D for an example of Augusta State University's guarantee). Furthermore, new requirements contained in Title II of the Higher Education Act require preparation programs to develop systems to follow up on the success of their graduates.

Conclusion: The Need for New Teacher Standards and Adequate Program Funding

States have a clear interest in ensuring that new teachers receive the support they need to develop excellent practice. In a system that holds preparation programs accountable for teacher quality, the programs also have a vested interest in helping new teachers succeed. K-12 schools with new teachers on staff also clearly have an interest in developing high levels of practice among novices. Consequently, the Study Group believes that fostering collaboration around new teacher induction is not only a necessary part of building a coordinated system, it may be one of its more popular undertakings. States also, however, need to lead at least two related initiatives that may prove to be more challenging. First, they need to spearhead the development of standards for new teacher knowledge and performance that guide induction experiences and new teacher and preparation program evaluation. This may entail adopting or adapting existing standards such as the INTASC standards for beginning teachers (see Appendix E) or developing original standards based upon statewide input from constituents. Second, they need to ensure that adequate funding is available to provide all teachers, regardless of the fiscal resources of the district in which they work, with high-quality induction. Ensuring action on both of these fronts may require state policymakers to lead a difficult and often contentious—but ultimately worthwhile—effort.

State Actions to Consider

To address system and institutional disconnection:

- Decide upon the role of the preparing institution in providing induction services to novice teachers.

To address uncoordinated governance structures:

- Work with all state education governing bodies to ensure that teacher induction includes the participation of everyone with an interest in teacher quality: K-12 schools, districts, and education and arts and sciences faculty at IHEs.

To address lack of standards:

- Develop standards that define the level of practice expected of teachers after one or two years in the classroom and use these standards to evaluate the outcomes of particular induction programs.
- Out of a concern for equity, ensure participation of all new teachers in any induction program.
- To ensure that even the neediest districts can afford to provide high-quality induction for new teachers, consider methods of state, rather than local, program support.

Chapter V

Ensuring Program Results with an Effective Accountability System

Virtually every K-12 system in the country is now working within an accountability system that expects specific student learning outcomes to be met—and often inflicts strict sanctions and/or provides comprehensive supports to students, schools, and districts that fail to meet them. But teacher preparation programs have never been held accountable for the outcomes of their work in the way that K-12 schools now are. **The Study Group believes that it is critical to develop an accountability system that defines specific outcomes, in coordination with K-12 student expectations, for both novice teachers and the programs in which they are prepared.** The Study Group believes that this accountability system needs to link teacher performance and preparation program outcomes to student achievement. Not only should new teachers and the programs that prepare them be held accountable, but the extent to which policymakers, individual university faculty, administrators, and district personnel help new teachers succeed also needs to be evaluated according to clear, valid, and reliable measures of attainment that are tied to fair consequences for performance.

Elements of an Accountability System

Any accountability system requires at least three elements in order to be effective: standards, measures of attainment, and stakes.

Standards. Devising standards for all elements of a coordinated teacher preparation system requires the participation of K-12 schools, teachers, teacher preparation programs, higher education administrators, and the policy boards that govern all levels of the system. Traditionally, state policymakers have often considered program approval requirements and teacher licensure requirements a de facto system of standards for preparation programs and new teachers, respectively. However, the Study Group asserts that neither teacher licensure nor program approval standards, as they are currently defined in most states, accomplish what standards need to do.

In general, licensure standards for teachers are not designed to ensure high-quality performance; rather, they define minimum competencies for entrance to the field. Still, the ability of teachers to meet licensure requirements has become a standard by which preparation programs are often judged. At the same time, program approval requirements, another set of criteria upon which preparation programs are commonly judged, have traditionally focused upon program inputs rather than outcomes and have had little actual impact in driving the quality of teachers or preparation programs upward. This does not mean that both teacher licensure and program approval requirements cannot be re-constructed to meaningfully impact the quality of teachers in a state. As a matter of fact, some states have been approaching the issue of standards in just that way. New York, for example, requires preparation programs to meet specific outcomes criteria in order to retain their state approval, and Connecticut requires all teachers to demonstrate high levels of competency on performance assessments by the end of their induction program.

Some states have found that using existing national sets of standards for their teachers and preparation programs is a constructive and efficient way to build a coordinated system of teacher preparation. For example, INTASC has developed a set of

competencies that they believe new teachers should possess (see Appendix E) as well as a portfolio assessment process that is aligned with these competencies. Both NCATE and TEAC have developed criteria upon which to evaluate the quality of teacher preparation programs (see Appendices B and C).

Regardless of whether states decide to adopt existing standards or devise their own, **the Study Group emphasizes that state policymakers need to be well informed of their options and decide upon a standards system that most appropriately aligns with their particular expectations for K-12 students.** Furthermore, while nationally devised standards can be used effectively in states across the country, **adopting a national set of standards does not release state policymakers from their own responsibility to ensure that the coordinated system of preparation operates effectively and that standards across all levels of the system are appropriate.**

A Note about Outcomes-Based Measures of Professional Effectiveness

High-quality teaching performances that are likely to cultivate high-quality learning outcomes are complex. They include both overt actions that are relatively easy to evaluate (such as the use of accepted teaching methods and materials) and covert processes (such as synthesis, judgment, observation, calculation, and historical analysis) that are more difficult to measure. Furthermore, although high-quality teachers clearly do impact student achievement, evidence conflicts as to the extent of that impact. Without a doubt, other variables also affect the amount and quality of student learning.

The performances of any accomplished professional are always intended to achieve a positive result. But, while the consequences of performances are important, they are not the only variable by which to judge quality. The quality of the performances in and of themselves, as defined by professional standards, can also be an important component of evaluation. For example, doctors should be judged in part by the number of lives saved, and lawyers should be judged in some measure by the number of cases won. But doctors and lawyers who accept the "tough cases," consistently demonstrate high-quality performance according to established professional standards, and yet fail to save every life or win every case need to be evaluated in some measure by the professional standards they demonstrate in their practice. The same should apply to teachers.

When a teacher or preparation program fails to meet established outcomes, professional performances need to be scrutinized for their adherence to currently accepted practice. This does not imply "letting anyone off the hook." While it was erroneous in years past to blame student failure on every variable except the teacher, it would equally simplistic to assume that student failure is, without exception, a direct reflection of teacher or preparation program quality.

In its insistence upon "outcomes-based" standards and measures of effectiveness, the Study Group believes it is important to emphasize that evaluation is not strictly linear—that is, that a teacher or program either reaches performance outcomes and is "good" or fails to reach them and is "bad." Furthermore, the Study Group recognizes that simple, linear notions of evaluation based upon outcomes can discourage teachers or university faculty from accepting the "tough cases." The best evaluation systems are those that emphasize outcomes, while allowing outcomes to be investigated in relation to other mediating factors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Measures of Attainment. Once standards are developed across the system, the next step is to devise effective ways to measure the extent to which the standards have been met. Taking the Study Group's premise that quality in teacher preparation needs to be tied primarily to teachers' effect on student achievement, it is critical that states ensure that their standards and measures of attainment do indeed reflect the skills and knowledge that correlate with good teaching.

A common way to measure the success of preparation programs is to examine the percentage of graduates that pass state licensure tests. The Group believes that this approach is problematic for several reasons:

- Many current licensure tests require little more knowledge than is expected of a high school graduate;[24]
- Many current licensure tests do not include an evaluation of teacher practice; and
- In many cases, there is no established correlation between the content of a teacher licensure test and the ability of a teacher to help students reach high standards.

Some states also continue to sanction preparation programs that meet traditional program approval requirements, but these measures usually focus more on inputs than outcomes and demonstrate little correlation with the elements of effective teaching.

This is not to say that both licensure test results and program approval requirements cannot play a role in measuring the quality of a teacher preparation program. On the contrary, the Study Group believes that well constructed licensure tests and some types of program approval requirements can measure some elements of effective preparation. But because of the complex nature of teaching and the imperfect nature of measurement and evaluation, no one measure can capture all of the elements of effective teaching. Consequently, the Study Group believes **that effective methods to measure teacher and program quality must include multiple measures.** Although no single measure has yet been able to conclusively measure effective teaching or the effective preparation of teachers, collectively using several different evaluations of teacher knowledge and skills can paint a relatively complete picture of an individual's teaching ability.

National systems of accreditation of teacher preparation programs have begun to model the kind of outcomes-based evaluation that the Study Group recommends. Both NCATE and TEAC require teacher preparation programs to demonstrate evidence of outcomes in terms of measures of teacher success in the classroom. Depending upon the accreditation sought, several measures may be considered measures of programmatic success. For example:

- Student grades;
- Portfolios of academic achievement;
- Student scores on licensure tests;
- Student scores on graduate admissions tests;
- Job placement rates;
- Job placement rates in schools that are hard to staff;
- Program completion rates;
- Evaluations by employers of program graduates;
- Alumni follow-up studies;
- Professional recognition of graduates;
- Rates of professional advanced study among graduates;
- Standardized scores and gains of the program graduates' own students; and
- Professional advancement of program graduates.

Whatever measures ultimately comprise an accountability system, the Study Group believes that policymakers must be able to tie the measures to clear policy statements about the types and

The Higher Education Act, Accountability, and the Improvement of Teacher Preparation

In 1998, Congress reauthorized the Higher Education Act and added several provisions to improve the coordination and accountability of teacher preparation programs. Title II of the Act authorizes approximately $300 million for teacher preparation and recruitment. Among initiatives established by the Act:

Teacher preparation partnerships provide grants to build partnerships between teacher preparation institutions and local school districts, particularly in high-need areas. These partnerships are intended to:

- Implement reforms that hold teacher preparation programs accountable for the quality of candidates they prepare;
- Improve candidates' knowledge of academic content by increasing collaboration between faculty of education and arts and sciences;
- Ensure that candidates have significant clinical experiences by improving links between universities and K-12 schools;
- Help candidates use technology in teaching and learning; and
- Prepare candidates to work with diverse students.

State teacher quality enhancement grants encourage states to raise the quality of their teachers by:

- Strengthening their licensure standards;
- Holding preparation institutions accountable for preparing teachers who have excellent teaching skills and significant content knowledge;
- Supporting alternate routes to licensure for highly qualified individuals such as mid-career professionals and military personnel; and
- Recruiting new candidates to the field who are high quality.

The new law also establishes strict new accountability requirements. Beginning in 2000, states and higher education institutions need to prepare "report cards" on the quality of teacher preparation. For institutions, this requires reporting to their state on: graduates' performance on state licensure exams; basic program components such as number of students and the amount of clinical experience required of candidates; and whether the program is classified by the state as "low performing." For states, the law requires reporting to the federal government on: licensing and certification requirements; descriptions of alternate routes; percentage of candidates who pass licensure tests, both statewide and by institution; information concerning the use of waivers of emergency licenses and their distribution across schools and subject areas; state criteria for evaluating the quality of preparation programs; and any other areas that bear on the quality of new teachers in a state.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

level of performance and attributes they expect of teachers. At a minimum, this requires the development of clearly measurable beginning teacher standards that correlate with the skills needed to teach K-12 standards and are tied to outcome measures in individual teacher preparation programs that can inform the program approval process. States may also choose to require accreditation of preparation programs as another measure of program quality. **The Study Group believes, however, that while accreditation can be an important component of program accountability, it does not replace the state's own responsibility to evaluate every preparation program according to specific state standards.**

Stakes. When standards are in place and measures of attainment are clearly demonstrating the extent to which they are being met, states must be able to respond to the results of those measures with a set of consequences. Some states have recently devised accountability programs for teacher preparation programs with high stakes. In Texas, for example, teacher preparation institutions must have student pass rates of 80 percent or higher on state licensure tests. This rate applies not simply to graduates as a whole but also to all ethnic groups and all groups of candidates by subject category. A program that fails to reach this rate in all categories is at risk of losing state approval. In New York, the State Board of Regents have also recently required all teacher preparation programs to meet an 80 percent pass standard similar to that in Texas. Programs that fail to meet the standard can be closed. For those who worry that closing preparation programs will exacerbate the teacher shortage, it is interesting to note that, at least in New York, there are some preparation programs that have licensure exam pass rates of less than 20 percent. In essence, New York has decided that, rather than believing that it cannot afford to close programs, in the case of exceptionally low licensure rates, they cannot afford *not* to. In Georgia, all school districts receive a "guarantee" with new-teacher hires; if a new teacher is not able to meet Georgia state teaching standards, the preparing institution must "take back" the teacher for more training until the standards can be met.

States that take their accountability system seriously need to be serious about implementing consequences for those programs that fail to meet standards. Consequences may range from providing support and intervention to failing programs to shutting these programs down. While the Study Group generally supports strong accountability programs that do not allow programs of low quality to continue to operate, it is important to consider at least two issues before implementing a system of closure:

- Accountability systems with high stakes such as program closure need to ensure that the measures of attainment that fuel the system are indeed measuring the critical elements of effective teaching; and

- The weight assigned to particular measures of attainment may differentially affect some teacher preparation programs. For example, accountability systems that rely upon teacher candidate scores on standardized tests may disproportionately close preparation programs that serve minority teacher candidates, since students of color are less likely to pass standardized licensure exams.

Ideally, the Study Group believes that a continuum of consequences for failing to meet standards is the most effective way to encourage high quality in teacher preparation. While there are certainly a group of preparation programs that deserve to be closed, there may also be others that would benefit from state support, technical assistance, and development resources. Thus, an effective accountability system with stakes includes clear guidelines for state intervention and program improvement. It may also include a plan for dealing with the unintended outcomes of program closure. For example, if states find that the institutions under threat of closure serve a disproportionate number of teacher candidates of color or candidates from a particular geographic area, states should have a plan in place to provide services to suit the needs of promising candidates that would have attended the closing program.

The Role of State Policy Evaluation in Ensuring Program Results

Building a coordinated system of teacher preparation that holds individuals and institutions accountable for their role in student achievement is a costly endeavor, not only in financial terms, but

also in terms of educators' and policymakers' efforts, future careers of teachers, and student achievement. If policymakers expect the public and the education system to support these costs, they must ensure that the teacher development system is effective, efficient, and equitable. This means that state boards and others involved in building the coordinated system need to implement responsive program planning, pay attention to the implemen ation processes across the various system components, ensure that individuals and institutions have the necessary materials to carry out their particular missions, and check to ensure that program intentions are realized in program outcomes. They also need to hold themselves accountable, just as they do others across the coordinated K-16 system, for the consequences of their actions and for their own role in helping students achieve high standards. Answering these questions requires an effective mechanism for program evaluation. The Study Group believes that **it is imperative that governance boards devise ways to hold themselves account-able for their role in planning, facilitating, and providing the resources to sustain a high-quality, coordinated system of teacher preparation.** This accountability could take the form of setting clear policy goals, establishing deadlines for meeting them, and publicly reporting state program and policy results.

Types of Program and Policy Evaluation

Several different types of evaluation can inform program improvement and policy development at different stages of implementation.

- **Development evaluation** consists of doing needs assessments and research reviews to define the problems a particular preparation program or K-16 system needs to resolve;
- **Design evaluation** judges program or policy design, usually before implementation, and clarifies its logic and feasibility;
- **Process evaluation** studies the implementation of the teacher development system and often looks for intended and unintended consequences of the program or policy implementation;
- **Management evaluation** looks for efficiencies and inefficiencies in how the preparation program or K-16 policy system is managed; and
- **Impact evaluation** takes places after a program or K-16 policy system has been operating for several years and examines the system or program in relation to its long-term goals and objectives.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Unfortunately, the norm today is that systematic evaluation of state systems rarely takes place unless there is overwhelming public or political pressure to do so. This is a mistake that can cost states dearly in terms of accuracy, usefulness of their data concerning the system under scrutiny, K-12 student achievement, efficiency of their K-16 system, fairness to teachers and institutions of higher education, and credibility and public support. State boards of education need to hold themselves and the state education department accountable for understanding the effects of individual components of a coordinated K-16 system of teacher preparation. They also need to encourage their colleagues at other levels of the system to do the same.

Because evaluation can greatly improve policy and programs, policymakers across the educational spectrum need to consider such evaluations alongside policy development and program improvement. Doing so requires attention to several factors:

Data quality. Simply collecting data about a coordinated teacher preparation system is not sufficient. Rather, the data must meet several criteria in order to effectively help programs improve. First, data must be specifically designed to answer particular questions of interest to policymakers. Second, data must be valid, meaning that they truly measure what they are intended to measure. Third, data must be reliable, meaning that the data measures remain consistent through multiple measures over time. Fourth, the data that is collected must be streamlined according to clearly defined priorities; collecting too much data can not only make the system unwieldy, but it can make respondents less likely to respond accurately and thoughtfully. Finally, when evaluating a complex system such as a teacher preparation program or a K-16 coordinated education system, data must be collected from multiple measures. Data that do not meet these five criteria are unable to meaningfully inform any significant program improvement and therefore waste valuable resources.

Participation. In order to make evaluations more valid and reliable, state boards need to give special attention to ensure that a representative sample of every group impacted by the results of teacher preparation policies is invited to participate in the design of the evaluation as well as in the evaluation itself.

Internal v. external evaluators. Deciding whether to have department staff conduct an evaluation or to contract an external evaluator has many implications for the evaluation itself. Evaluations undertaken by department staff are usually faster and cheaper, but external evaluations may be more objective and further removed from any politics surrounding the coordinated teacher preparation system. The Study Group believes that effective evaluation needs to contain a balance of both internal and external evaluation components.

Communications. Effective program evaluation and policy analysis provides information that can be shared with the public and interested constituents in order to encourage dialogue. On the other hand, when an evaluation points out a need for improvement, a wide range of special interest groups may try to co-opt the results for their agenda. To balance this, the state board needs to ensure that a communications plan is in place to help guide public conversation about the evaluation in constructive ways.

Using results. Before undertaking program or policy evaluation, policymakers must be confident that they have the money, resources, and momentum at their disposal to respond to the results effectively and make necessary changes. Authorizing an evaluation and then neglecting to respond to its conclusions is not only a waste of time, money, and resources, but it can jeopardize the public credibility of both the program and teachers that it produces. Building support from all constituents and state policy bodies involved in the coordinated system is one effective way to improve the likelihood of state resources being available for needed changes.

State Actions to Consider

To address system and institutional disconnection:

- Require institutions to collaborate, and build measures of collaboration into a state accountability system.

To address uncoordinated governance structures:

- Work with other policymaker groups where necessary to carefully consider program accreditation as one method to improve the quality and accountability of preparation programs.
- Encourage policymakers at all levels of the education system to work together to develop an accountability system that holds all levels of education responsible for their role in teacher preparation.

To address lack of standards:

- Ensure that the standards, measures of attainment, and stakes that constitute a state accountability system align with new teacher and preparation program standards.
- Check if the state accountability system includes multiple measures that clearly link to teacher characteristics that improve student learning.
- Require institutions that prepare teachers to be evaluated by third-party evaluators.
- Review the state program approval requirements to ensure that they are outcomes-oriented and demand high quality for approval.
- Undertake regular and rigorous evaluations of state policies and programs to ensure that they support efforts to build a coordinated and accountable system of teacher preparation.
- Develop a graded system of intervention for preparation programs and others involved in the teacher preparation process that fail to meet standards.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Endnotes

[1]R. Ferguson, "Paying for Public Education: New Evidence on How and Why Money Matters," *Harvard Journal on Legislation* 28 (1991): 465-98, quoted in Barnett Berry, "Quality Alternatives in Teacher Preparation: Dodging the 'Silver Bullet' and Doing What Is Right for Students," *State Education Standard* 1 (2000): 21-25.

[2]Eric Hirsh, "Teacher Policy: A Summary of Current Trends," *State Legislative Report* 23, no. 5 (1998). National Conference of State Legislatures.

[3]W. L. Sanders and J. C. Rivers, *Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Academic Achievement*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center, 1996.

[4]In these two states, changes in student achievement were measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

[5]Linda Darling-Hammond, "Teaching and Knowledge," in *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (second edition), ed. John Sikula (New York, NY: Association of Teacher Educators, 1996).

[6]D. H. Monk, "Subject-Area Preparation of Secondary Math and Science Teachers and Student Achievement," *Economics of Education Review* 13, no. 2 (1994): 125-145. Also see, for example, information from the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation Teacher Quality Clearinghouse, online at www.tqclearinghouse.org/issues/education.html.

[7]P. Ashton and L. Crocker, "Does Teacher Certification Make a Difference?" *Florida Journal of Teacher Education* 3 (1986): 73-83.

[8]R. F. Ferguson, "Can Schools Narrow the Black-White Test Score Gap?" in *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, ed. C. Jencks and M. Phillips (Washington, DC: Brookings Institute, 1998), 318-374; E. A. Hanushek, "The Tradeoff between Teacher Quality and Quantity," *Journal of Political Economy* 100, no. 1 (1992): 85-117.

[9]National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (New York, NY: Teachers College at Columbia University, 1996).

[10]Ibid; American Council on Education, *To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers Are Taught* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1999).

[11]See, for example, *What Matters Most*; also see information from the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation Teacher Quality Clearinghouse.

[12]American Federation of Teachers, *Building a Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction* (Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers, 2000); National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, *What Matters Most*.

[13]National Association of State Boards of Education, *The Numbers Game* (Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1998).

[14]Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), "Bridging the K-12/Postsecondary Divide with a Coherent K-16 System," *CPRE Policy Briefs* (June 2000).

[15]Yvonne Gold, "Beginning Teacher Support: Attrition, Mentoring, and Induction," in *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*.

[16]See, for example, *What Matters Most*.

[17]C. J. Gips and C. F. Stoel, eds., *Making a Place in the Faculty Rewards System for Work with K-12: A Project Report of Four Universities* (Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1999).

[18]M. Inger, "Teacher Collaboration in Urban Secondary Schools," ERIC/CUE Digest Number 93, ERIC Identifier: ED363676 (New York: Eric Clearinghouse on Urban Education, 1993).

[19]American Council on Education, *To Touch the Future*.

[20]R. R. Henke, S. Geis, and J. Giambattista, *Out of the Lecture Hall and into the Classroom: 1992-93 College Graduates and Elementary/Secondary School Teaching* (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, 1996).

[21]L. Darling-Hammond, *Solving the Dilemmas of Teacher Supply, Demand, and Standards* (New York, NY: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, 1999).

[22]Gold, "Beginning Teacher Support."

[23]R. J. Murnane and R. J. Olson, "The Effects of Salaries and Opportunity Costs on Length of Stay in Teaching—Evidence from North Carolina," *Journal of Human Resources* 25, no. 1 (1990): pp. 106-24.

[24]R. Mitchell and P. Barth, *How Teacher Licensing Tests Fall Short* (Washington, DC: The Education Trust, 1999).

Appendix A

Draft Standards for Professional Development Schools from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Threshold Condition 1: An agreement which commits school, school district, union/professional association, and university to the basic mission of a PDS: The preparation of new teachers, support of children's learning, continuing professional development, and practice based inquiry within a school.

Indicators

1. Each partner simultaneously demonstrates commitment to its unique institutional mission and its shared PDS mission.
2. There is agreement among partners to shared decision making in areas which directly and indirectly affect the mission of the PDS.
3. PDS mission and mission of school and university cohere.

Threshold Condition 2: Commitment by the partners to the critical attributes of a PDS: There should be tangible commitment from each partner to (a) the support of a learning community for adults and children; (b) collaboration; (c) accountability and quality assurance; (d) the development of organization, roles, and structures that support these attributes; and (e) equity as it affects students and teachers.

Indicators

1. Partnership agreements acknowledge the five critical attributes of a PDS and commit partners to working toward achieving them.
2. Partners have a plan designed to develop these attributes in their PDS.
3. Partners demonstrate they have taken organizational, structural, and financial steps toward achieving these attributes.
4. Shared language is heard among participants.

Threshold Condition 3: Positive working relationship and a basis for trust between partners.

Indicators

1. University participants share the school's commitment to its community.
2. Professional relationships reflect trust.
3. PDS participants demonstrate a commitment to learning how to work together.

Threshold Condition 4: Achievement of quality standards by partner institutions as evidenced by regional, state, national or other review.

Indicators

1. Partner selection process reflects personal knowledge and history.
2. Partner selection process is jointly developed.
3. Selection criteria are public and process is open.
4. Participation criteria include national, state, or regional accreditation for P-12 school.
5. Partner school of education is NCATE-accredited or a candidate for NCATE accreditation.

Threshold Condition 5: Institutional commitment of resources to the PDS from school and university.

Indicators

1. Resources are clustered to create new roles, structures, and opportunities to learn.
2. Resources are blended to achieve integration of PDS functions and integration of PDS into partner institutions.
3. Institutional leaders support the PDS mission.

4. Partners provide support for PDS development.

5. School system, university, and teachers' union/association demonstrate openness to change.

Critical Attribute I: Learning Community. The PDS is a learning-centered community characterized by norms and practices which support adult and children's learning. Indications of a learning-centered community include: public teaching practice; integration of intern and teacher learning with school instructional program; collegiality; inquiry; and dissemination of new knowledge. Opportunities to learn are equitably supported.

Critical Attribute II: Collaboration. A PDS is characterized by joint work among school and university faculty directed at implementing the mission. Responsibility for learning is shared; research is jointly defined and implemented; all participants share expertise in the interests of children's and adults' learning.

Critical Attribute III: Accountability and Quality Assurance. The PDS is accountable to the public and to the profession for upholding professional standards for teaching and learning and for preparing new teachers in accordance with these standards.

Critical Attribute IV: Organization, Roles, and Structures. The PDS uses processes and allocates resources and time to systematize the continuous improvement of learning to teach, teaching, learning, and organizational life.

Critical Attribute V: Equity. A PDS is characterized by norms and practices which support equity and learning by all students and adults.

To view the complete standards, visit NCATE's website at www.ncate.org

Appendix D

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has recently revised their standards. NCATE's performance-based system of accreditation is based on data about the quality of teacher candidates' knowledge of subject matter and ability to teach effectively. To become accredited, teacher preparation institutions must submit a self-study that describes how they meet the standards. An on-site visiting team examines the education unit and assesses its strengths and weaknesses in relation to the standards. Prior to the visit, the institution prepares information on how it meets subject-matter standards. NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board makes a final accreditation decision. Over 500 schools and colleges of education currently hold NCATE accreditation.

NCATE membership includes members of the public, 33 national professional organizations representing those who teach in and operate P-12 schools, and those who educate teachers. NCATE has been reviewed by the U.S. Secretary of Education according to Congressionally mandated standards for accrediting agencies and has been recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

I. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions Candidates must know the content of their field and possess the knowledge and skill to teach it effectively. In addition, candidates from accredited institutions gain a liberal arts background along with professional knowledge. Schools of education must provide evidence that they have used national and state standards to design and deliver programs and provide evidence that their candidates meet the standards. PRAXIS II or another content knowledge test may assess subject-matter knowledge. Candidates' ability to synthesize content to help P-12 students understand it is also evaluated.

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation The school of education must have a system to assess its candidates that is designed according to professional, state, and institutional standards, and they must use this data derived from these assessments for program improvement. The assessments should be embedded in the preparation programs, and should be conducted on a continuing basis, both to help candidates improve their skills and to evaluate candidate progress and competence. Schools of education should use multiple assessments in various forms and establish criteria for determining levels of acceptable candidate performance.

II. Unit Capacity

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Standard 4. Diversity The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they collaborate with colleagues in disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty and facilitates professional development.

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

To learn more about NCATE, visit its website at www.ncate.org

Appendix C

The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) is a nonprofit organization of institutions of higher education and other groups and individuals devoted to the improvement of academic degree programs for professional educators. Primarily, TEAC provides public assurance, in the form of institutional accreditation, that particular preparation programs prepare competent, caring, and qualified professional educators.

After institutions meet specific eligibility requirements, TEAC requires that they prepare a research monograph about their preparation program that demonstrates evidence of student learning; evidence that their assessment of student learning is valid; and evidence of the program's continuous improvement and quality control. TEAC then audits the evidence presented in each institution's monograph and, based upon the soundness of evidence for the three elements of quality, decides whether or not to accredit preparation programs.

Specifically, the three quality principles require faculty to gather evidence in several areas:

Quality Principle I: Evidence of Student Learning

- **Subject-Matter Knowledge**—including academic subject the candidate will teach, knowledge about learning how to learn, an understanding of multicultural perspectives, and an ability to integrate technology into teaching and learning;
- **Liberal Education**—including broad knowledge fields that the candidate will never be expected to teach directly but that are associated with and expected of educated persons;
- **Pedagogical Knowledge**—including evidence that candidates know how to convert knowledge of a subject into compelling lessons that meet the needs of a wide range of pupils; and
- **Teaching Skill**—including evidence that teachers can teach effectively and professionally in ways that bring students to appropriate levels of achievement.

Quality Principle II: Valid Assessment of Student Learning

- **Rationale for Links among Assessments, Program Design, and TEAC Goal**—demonstrating linkages among these three elements within the preparation program and demonstrating their relationship to claims made about student learning; and
- **Evidence of Valid Assessment**—satisfying both the institutional faculty and TEAC that inferences drawn from assessments are valid and reliable.

Quality Principle III: Institutional Learning

- **Program Decisions and Planning Based on Evidence**—demonstrating that information derived from Quality Principles I and II play a continuing role in decisions to modify programs, assessment systems, pedagogical approaches, faculty composition, and other institutional variables; and
- **Influential Quality Control System**—the faculty must have a system to review and evaluate programs, students, faculty accomplishments, courses, programs requirements, and other elements of the program and this system must promote continual program improvement.

Fifty-two programs currently have candidate status in TEAC. The faculty in twenty programs have begun to develop a research monograph in which they document evidence of what their students have learned, the validity of their assessments of student learning, and the basis upon which the faculty make decisions concerning program improvement.

To learn more about TEAC, visit its website at www.teac.org

Appendix D

Augusta State University Educator Guarantee

Guarantee Description

August State University (ASU) guarantees the effective performance of teachers, counselors, and school leaders who complete programs in the College of Education and are recommended for initial certification. The College of Education (COE) guarantees that each person recommended for initial certification has met all requirements of the program. These educators have acquired the competencies associated with the established principles at the level of a beginning educator/counselor/leader, as described in the "Descriptors of Principles" documents for the appropriate position. The employing school district is expected to show evidence of appropriate mentoring for new educators. In order for ASU to document performance of educators and provide program evaluation data, employers of all ASU guaranteed educators will be asked to complete an "Assessment Summary" at three points during the first year of employment.

During the first two years after recommendation for certification, any ASU graduate who fails to demonstrate the essential competencies will be provided additional assistance. ASU will be responsible for reasonable costs related to an individualized plan agreed upon by the Intervention Committee, such as tuition, fees, and textbooks, and on-site or distance learning assistance by faculty. (Educator travel costs and ordinary supplies are not included.) The plan may include on-campus courses, distance learning courses, web-based courses, staff development courses or training, and/or intensive mentoring or induction support. Some training/assistance may be provided through distance technology or through arrangements mutually agreed upon by a local higher education institution and the COE.

The College of Education will not be held accountable under the guarantee for graduates who, during the two-year life of the guarantee:

- are employed outside their field of certification as recommended by ASU;
- are employed with a provisional certificate in a field while attempting to secure clear renewable certification in that field;
- engage in unethical behaviors that violate the Georgia Educators Code of Professional Ethics;
- exhibit any other behaviors which are incompatible with school district policy; and
- commit criminal acts.

Assessment Process for Guaranteed Educators

1. School administrators/supervisors of all guaranteed educators who are recommended for certification by Augusta State University will use appropriate Assessment Summary at the end of 9 weeks, 18 weeks, and 36 weeks and submit to the Office of the Dean of Education.
2. Guaranteed educators who perform at the acceptable or improving level will not require intervention by Augusta State University.
3. School administrator/supervisor who requests intervention by ASU will meet with the educator and jointly complete a request for intervention.
4. The appropriate ASU department chair will send to the school administrator/ supervisor a description of the process to be followed, including the intervention request packet.
5. School administrator/supervisor will send the completed intervention request packet to the ASU department chair.
6. The ASU department chair will review the packet and appoint an ASU representative to meet with the administrator and educator.
7. The ASU representative will meet with the administrator and educator and collect evidence through observations of the educator in his/her classroom/context and interview the administrator and educator individually.
8. The Intervention Committee—including the ASU department chair, ASU representative, school

administrator, and educator—will review all evidence to determine whether an intervention is needed. If so, the committee will develop an intervention plan for meeting identified needs.

9. The Intervention Committee will meet as needed to review progress toward completing the plan. The school administrator and ASU representative continue to observe and work with the educator until the Intervention Committee determines that the educator no longer needs intervention.

Appendix E

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Model Standards for New Teachers

Principle #1: The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Principle #2: The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.

Principle #3: The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Principle #4: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Principle #5: The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Principle #6: The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Principle #7: The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Principle #8: The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Principle #9: The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Principle #10: The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

To view the complete standards, visit INTASC's website at www.ccsso.org/intasc.html

Appendix F

Presenters to the Study Group on Coordination and Accountability in Teacher Education

Shari Francis
Vice-President for State Relations
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036-1023

Dr. Gary Galluzzo
Dean, Graduate School of Education
George Mason University
4400 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444

Dr. Mary Gendernalik Cooper
Professor and Chair
Department of Teacher Development
School of Education
Augusta State University
2500 Walton Way
Augusta, GA 30904-2200

Dr. George Mehaffy
Vice President for Academic Leadership and Change
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
1307 New York Avenue, NW
Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20005-4701

Dr. Frank Murray
President, Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)
University of Delaware
Willard Hall Educational Building, Room 101
Newark, DE 19716

Dr. Raymond Pecheone
Chief, Bureau of Program and Teacher Evaluation
Connecticut Department of Education
165 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

Dr. Robert C. Rice
Assistant State Superintendent for Research and Development
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201-2595

Dr. Tony Rollins
Assistant Executive Director
National Education Association
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Jan Somerville
Staff Officer
National Association of System Heads (NASH)
1725 K Street, NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006

Dr. Joan Baratz Snowden
Deputy Director, Educational Issues Department
American Federation of Teachers
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

NASBE Study Group Reports

NASBE's highly regarded reports from state board study groups are each the result of a year-long or more examination of a critical education issue. After reviewing recent research and meeting with practitioners and national experts, these committees release their recommendations and reports to policymakers and the education community.

Principals of Change: What Education Leaders Need to Guide Schools to Excellence 1999

The Future Is Now: Addressing Social Issues in Schools of the 21st Century 1999

The Numbers Game: Ensuring Quantity and Quality in the Teaching Work 1998

Public Accountability for Student Success: Standards for Education Accountability Systems 1998

The Full Measure: The Report of the NASBE Study Group on Statewide Assessment Systems 1997

Financing Student Success: Beyond Equity and Adequacy 1997

Building Our Future: Making School Facilities Ready for the 21st Century 1996

A Motion to Reconsider: Education Governance at a Crossroads 1996

Framework for the Future: Creating a School-to-Work System for Learning, Livelihood, and Life 1995

Schools Without Fear: Violence and Its Impact on Schools and Learning 1994

Learning for a Lifetime: The Report of the NASBE Study Group on State Board Linkages with Higher Education 1994

Winners All: A Call for Inclusive Schools 1992

The American Tapestry: Educating a Nation—*A Guide to Infusing Multiculturalism into American Education* 1991

Realizing Teacher Reform: A State Action Plan for Developing the Profession 1990

More Than a Vision: Real Improvements in Urban Education 1990

Partners in Educational Improvement: School, Parents, and the Community 1989

Rethinking Curriculum: A Call for Fundamental Reform 1988

The National Association of State Boards of Education is a nonprofit, private association that represents state and territorial boards of education. Our principal objectives are to strengthen state leadership in education policymaking; promote excellence in the education of all students; advocate equality of access to educational opportunity; and assure responsible lay governance of public education.

ISBN 1-58434-046-0
90000>
9 781584 340461

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").